

THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NO. 69-VOL. III, NO. 17.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

CONTENTS:

Politics That Mean Something.
A Way Out of It.
Fettering Niagara to Marsden.
Will Australia be First in the Race?
The Pinkerton Troops.
Strenuous Which Show the Wind.
Cable of the Arctic.
How They Lay It.
The Sugar Question.
A Voice from Bolivia.
The Single Tax.
Wagon and the Tariff.
Foreign Notes.
A Negro's Inspiration.
A Case for Medical Treatment.
The Shepard and the Sheep.
Fast and Slow Progress.
Men and Things.
Foreign Notes.
The Booming of the Drums.
Queries and Answers.
Cigarettes' Troubles.
Cables London.
Trade.
Pen, Pencil and Scales.
Mr. Dana's Brothers.
Boasting of the Sea (Poem).
Mrs. Muller's House.
The London (Poem).
Tax the Land (Poem).
Philadelphia's Homes.
Go West, Young Man.
The Single Tax Movement.
Women.

POLITICS THAT MEAN SOMETHING.

Mr. Mills's speech in opening the tariff debate, as printed in full in the *Congressional Record*, justifies the impression produced by the telegraphic reports. It is a manly, vigorous, and most effective free trade speech, abounding with telling points that go to the very heart of protection. It ought to be largely circulated as a campaign document.

If there remained in the mind of any one a lingering doubt lest the issue between the two giant parties should be settled into a mere question of tariff tinkering Mr. McMullin's speech on the opening of the tariff debate on Tuesday last should dispel it. "I would be gratified," said the Tennessee congressman, "to have any man explain the justice of requiring one man to contribute a tax in order to make another man's vocation." This is not talking tariff reduction. It is talking free trade. The man who fires his revolver at a burglar is doing a little more than merely asking his furtive visitor to surrender part of his spoil.

The democratic clubs and politicians are wheeling into line splendidly, and it is now certain that protectionists like Messrs. Charles A. Dana and Samuel J. Randall will ere long have to "eat crow" or go over formally to the republican party. And a great body of republicans and men who have cared nothing for either of the old parties, are moving toward the support of Mr. Cleveland, now that he has raised the standard of true democratic principles. The coming election means in fact a reconstruction of both parties. Though old names will be preserved, the real struggle will be between protection and free trade—that is to say, between special privilege and equality of rights, between the principle of restriction and the principle of freedom.

Mr. Cleveland, it is now certain, will be nominated at St. Louis by acclamation. Who shall be nominated for vice-president is not determined. But it is time that a southern man was placed on the presidential ticket, and the southern man whom the democracy would do best to put there is ROGER Q. MILLS of Texas.

The empire state of the north, and the empire state of the south! Grover Cleveland of New York and Roger Q. Mills of Texas! It is a ticket that would make the protectionists howl. And that is the reason of its strength. The stronger the opposition the stronger the support. Every voter who really fears free trade will cast a ballot against Mr. Cleveland anyhow. If the Danas and the Randalls pretend to support him it will be but to stab him in the back. But if the fight be hot, men will see the absurdity of protection, and will be irritated by its pretensions. In such a struggle as the democratic party is now committed to, courage means certain victory. Timidity means defeat.

And here is something that would make the best kind of a democratic platform. It is from the report made to the house of representatives on May 19, 1888—just thirty years ago—by the special committee that in the earlier part of the session had been appointed to consider the whole subject of federal expenditure and revenue—the house of representatives being at that time democratic.

Resolved, That the vast and increasing expenditure of the federal government indicates the necessity of a change in our fiscal system, whereby the protective policy shall be entirely abandoned, and a resort had at as early a period as may be practicable exclusively to direct taxation. That the highest development of the industrial resources of the country is to be attained by the greatest freedom of exchanges, which can only be thoroughly accomplished by the entire abolition of duties on imports, and a resort exclusively to direct taxation. That the system of direct taxation presenting the most advantages is for each state to collect and pay over its quota, to be ascertained by the constitutional rule of apportionment, thus insuring perfect equality, and dispensing with multitudes of federal officers.

This report was signed by W. W. Boyce of South Carolina, Richard Mott of Ohio, John A. Quitman of Mississippi, Jacob R.

Wortendyke of New Jersey, and F. E. Spinner of New York.

Boyce, Wortendyke and Quitman were democrats; Mott and Spinner were republicans. But it is the true democratic doctrine on the tariff question; and now that the slavery question and the issues that followed it, have passed away, men who have called themselves republicans, and men who have called themselves democrats, will be found uniting again on the Jeffersonian platform of equality and freedom.

Perhaps it is too much of human nature to hope that such a convention as will assemble at St. Louis will adopt such a platform as this would be. But it really makes very little difference what sort of a platform they adopt. It is in this direction that the democratic party must inevitably go under the stimulus of the campaign. The real issue that will be discussed will be, not high tariff or low tariff, but protection or no tariff at all.

And this report made to congress after the Walker tariff had been running twelve years, and when our duties on imports were but nominal as compared with what they are now, indicates how rapidly experience was bringing our people to recognize the advantages of free trade. But for slavery our ports would now doubtless be open to the world, our ships would plow every sea, and we might be addressing ourselves to other tasks than that of proving that a people cannot tax themselves into prosperity. A generation has gone, and the fight against the robbery of protection is only beginning. But it will go on fast.

Andrew Carnegie, whose soul is filled with alarm for the beneficent system of "protection to American industry," has not yet gone to his castle in Scotland, but lingers on this side of the Atlantic, while his great steel works at Braddock are being filled up with Huns guarded by Pinkerton troops, with militia in readiness.

But his striking workmen have no business to complain. Have they not all the advantages which protection to the American workingman gives them? Has not all the rest of the country bowed to Pennsylvania for their sakes, and is there not a duty of twenty dollars a ton (seventy-four per cent) on steel rails, imposed, not for the advantage of their employer, but for their especial benefit? This ought to make them happy, though they stand idle. And if they are not happy, all they have to do is to spend their leisure in reading "Triumph of Democracy." It will show them that they ought to be happy, and that the man who cannot win fortune in this well protected and most glorious country is either imbecile or lazy. Andrew Carnegie came to this country a poor boy. Let them look at him.

But to do Mr. Carnegie justice, he does not pretend that we have to have a protective tariff here because of high wages, or that we are under disadvantage in production because of the lower wages of other countries. In fact, Mr. Carnegie is a protectionist in this country and as concerns this country. When he goes to the other side of the Atlantic he is a free trader. But Mr. Carnegie does not want the tariff kept up for his own advantage. No protected manufacturer does. The whole country might be gone through with a fine tooth comb to find a capitalist who wants that. Mr. Carnegie, if I understand him rightly, wants a protective tariff kept up (on steel, at least, in which he takes the most benevolent interest), because of our natural disadvantages. According to him—and as the largest steel manufacturer in the world he ought to be the best authority—God Almighty has made Great Britain an easier place to manufacture steel in than Pennsylvania, for there the coal, the iron stone and the lime are close together, whereas, while Pennsylvania has the coal, the ore has to be brought long distances—from Spain, Algiers or Michigan, and the lime must be transported. It would certainly seem to a "mere theorist" that if England was the best place to make steel in, it would be a good deal cheaper for us to get our steel from England, and to carry one ton of steel across the ocean rather than transport three and a half tons of raw material for long distances on land. But then, Mr. Carnegie points out, we should lose the business which all this transportation gives to our railroads, and all the employment this furnishes to our labor. What lots of transportation would we get if we prohibited railroads altogether. It would only be a step further in protection.

The war brought the nation one good thing—the taxing out of circulation of the notes issued by state banks, and the substitution for these local issues of a currency of uniform value throughout the United States. But the institution of the national banking system had nothing to do with this beneficial change. That was simply a sop to the banks—the bribing of these powerful corporations, by giving them special privileges at the expense of a people whose patriotism made them for the time careless of how they were taxed. While the ordinary citizen who bought a government bond, parted with his money in consideration of the interest he was

promised, the favored corporations who took advantage of the national banking law were given back in government notes, bearing their names, nine-tenths of the face value of their bonds—thus getting back nine-tenths of the money they were supposed to loan the government, while continuing to draw interest on the whole amount.

This virtual subsidizing of the national banks has cost the people far more than the vast sums paid to the national banks as interest on money they never loaned. The influence of the national banks upon our fiscal legislation is largely accountable for a policy which seems as if expressly designed to make the payment of the debt incurred during the war as costly as possible to tax payers. And now that the redemption of the debt threatens the withdrawal of the national bank circulation based upon the deposit of bonds, all sorts of plans are proposed to secure the continuance of the special privileges of the banks.

The proposition of Senator Farwell of Illinois to issue fifty-year two and a half per cent bonds for the use of the banks, on which they are to be allowed circulating notes to full par value, and to permit them to substitute for United States bonds, as a basis of circulation, state, county or municipal bonds at seventy-five per cent of their par value, is the latest of these propositions to perpetuate the national banks, and brings into striking light the preposterous nature of the whole system.

The issuing of a bond means, or ought to mean, the borrowing of money. Yet under Senator Farwell's proposition the United States is to issue bonds bearing two and a half per cent interest, to hand back to the purchasers all the money they pay for the bonds, and then to go on for fifty years paying them interest on money it has not borrowed and they have not loaned. And then to secure the perpetuity of this system of subsidizing the banks at the expense of the people, Senator Farwell proposes that the United States shall go into a similar one-sided banking business with these corporations on other securities than its own. Reduced to its simplest terms the proposition is simply that when these favored banks lend a state, county or municipality \$100 at four, five or six per cent interest, the United States is to lend them \$75 without interest.

If it should do this for the banks, why should it not do this for merchants, and manufacturers, and miners, and farmers, for the publishers of books and newspapers—and, in short, for everybody else? Banks are useful things, it is true. But farms, and factories, and ships, and dry goods stores, and carpenter shops, and boot black stands, and some newspapers, are also useful things. And if the national banks, who take good care to charge other people interest when they loan them money, are to be suffered to borrow money from the federal government without interest, why should not the United States go into this business of lending money free of interest to everybody?

Senator Farwell's preposterous proposition is only carrying one step further the existing system of bank subsidies. It is but a natural result of the manner in which the people of the United States have for years permitted themselves to be taxed for the benefit of a few favored corporations. There never was any good reason for the institution of the national banking system, and there is not to-day any good reason for its continuance. Like all special privileges, it is but a taxing of the many for the benefit of the few, and like all using of governmental power for private advantage, its results have been governmental extravagance and political demoralization. The pretense that there is some mystery about currency and banking that common people cannot understand, is like the pretense that no one but the members of the protected rings and trusts are competent to say what tariff taxes shall be levied on the people. The pretense that the national banking system rendered necessary aid in putting down the rebellion, and that it has given us a uniform currency, is like the pretense that we owe our growth and prosperity to the tariff. The national bank notes are current over the United States and fulfill the functions of generally acceptable money, not because they have the name of a bank printed on them, nor because bonds (on which the banks continue to draw interest) are deposited for their redemption; but because they are issued by the general government, bear its stamp, and rest upon its credit. They are in no wise better than the notes directly issued by the government, but derive their security and usefulness from the same source that gives the greenback its security and usefulness—the fact that they are issued by the government and are receivable for its dues. The only reason for continuing them is the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many. Every single dollar of the two hundred and seventy odd millions of national bank notes outstanding represents a dollar on which the people of the United States are taxed to pay interest, but which is loaned by a paternal government to the privileged banks without interest.

There is no legitimate connection be-

tween the functions of government and the business of banking.

The proper business of banking is the receiving, the keeping and the loaning out of money, and the facilitation of exchanges by the extension, interchange and cancellation of private credits. With the issuance of money the proper business of banking has nothing whatever to do.

It is one of the proper functions of the general government to issue money. But with the proper business of banking the government has rightly nothing whatever to do. There is no more reason for national banks subsidized by the government by loans of its money without interest, than there is for national grocery stores or national restaurants, for which government should supply the capital while private individuals took the profits.

Outside the bank of England there is not a single one of the many hundred English banks and banking institutions that has anything whatever to do with the issuing of money, and even in the United States, where this monstrous system of national banks has been suffered to grow up, a great part of the banking business of the country is conducted by banks like the Bank of America, Wells, Fargo & Co., and Drexel, Morgan & Co., that have nothing to do with issuing money, and yet discharge all the proper functions of banks as satisfactorily as do the subsidized corporations. To withdraw the national bank currency and to substitute for it notes directly issued by the government would be annually to save to the people millions directly, and still more millions indirectly; but it would not in the least interfere with the proper business of banking. If any of the national banks chose to wind up when their one sided partnership were dissolved, private banks would quickly take their places.

The national banking system is but an outgrowth and a part of the protective system. It having been conceded that it was a legitimate part of the business of government to levy taxes for the "encouragement" of capitalists who put their money into manufacturing enterprises, it was very natural that the capitalists who put their money into the business of banking should demand and should receive their share of "encouragement." Then the silver mine owners of the Pacific, who were able to buy seats in the senate, wanted their share of encouragement also. And taking advantage, on the one side of the false ideas propagated by the promoters of the conspiracy to enrich the creditor class at the expense of the debtor class, by the forced contraction of the currency; and on the other, of the crude notions of those who have wished to resist and reverse this process by a depreciation of the currency, they have got the United States government into the business of buying, coining and locking up \$2,000,000 of silver every month, for no other real purpose than the creation of an artificial demand for silver.

Not merely has all this been aided by the governmental extravagance fostered by the protective system, which has for its object the keeping up of taxation for the sake of taxation; but the first and most important of all the false steps made in the administration of our national finances during the war grew out of the popular acceptance of the protective fallacies. Our national currency was dishonored at the outset, a tremendous speculation set up in its depreciation (for gold having a comparatively uniform and stable value, what was called speculation in gold was in reality speculation in the greater or less depreciation of the currency) and the burden of the war debt was enormously enhanced by the law under which greenbacks were repudiated at the custom house, and the payment of duties required. The underlying motive in this provision was to keep up protective duties.

Now that the subsidy system is being called in question, and a great national campaign is to turn upon the issue between the theory of protection and the theory of free trade, it will not be long before the currency question also comes up. And the lines on which it ought to be settled are the simple lines of free trade—the equality of all citizens and no special privileges to any one. Let the buying of silver and the hoarding of gold be stopped. Let the bonds be called in and paid as fast as they mature, either in government notes to be issued for that purpose or in specie if it be preferred. Let the silver be sold for telephone wires, to which it is better adapted than any other metal, and would be far more useful than lying in vaults. Let a two and a half, or possibly a two per cent bond, be issued to whoever wants to pay for it at par, for which any one, whether he be a national banker or not, can have issued to him government notes to its face value whenever he chooses to present it to the treasury—the interest of course to cease the moment the bond is thus redeemed. With, perhaps, some provision for meeting general charges in the rate of interest by the issuance of bonds at a slightly higher or slightly lower rate of interest—a matter that could be far more safely left in the president's hands than the enormous powers of deposit and purchase now conferred to him—we should then have a cur-

rency that would automatically conform to the wants of the country, expanding when more currency was needed and contracting when it became superabundant.

Our national finances ought to be conducted on the simple principle that would govern any business man—that of paying as little interest as possible and putting his capital to its most productive use. But as we have been, and are now going, it is conducted on principles the very opposite.

The use of money is worth to the masses of the American people from six to twelve per cent—in fact, great numbers of them, in purchases on credit or on instalment, pay far higher rates. Yet by a system of taxation that takes from the ultimate tax payers at least five dollars for every dollar the government gets, we are wringing from them not only enough to maintain a most extravagant government, but to keep an enormous surplus idle. The federal tax gatherers are virtually taking seed wheat from the farmer, tools from the mechanic, machinery from the manufacturer—capital in some sort from every producer, in order to hoard coiled bullion in treasury vaults, to pay off bonds at a high premium before they are due, to deposit money with national banks without any charge for the use of it. And while we are paying enormous sums in interest on the public debt we are virtually lending hundreds of millions to these national banks without interest.

But at last, in the revolt against protection, the struggle against the system which prostitutes the powers of government to enrich the few and impoverish the many, has begun. Thanks partly to the courage of a few of its leaders, and partly to the attacks of its opponents, the democratic party is at last beginning to face in the direction of the principles of Jefferson.

Talking to a group of our friends a little while ago, when the expediency of running an independent ticket was being spoken of, Benjamin Urner of New Jersey, whose name is known to every old greenbacker in the country, said some very impressive things about the manner in which a reform movement might be retarded by being forced prematurely into party politics, instancing the greenback movement as an illustration with which he was thoroughly familiar. Just prior to the organization of the greenback party, Mr. Urner said, the masses of both the great parties were rapidly awakening to the injustice and waste of our financial policy; and the halls of congress rang with speeches from prominent and influential men among both republicans and democrats as earnest and radical as any subsequently delivered from the greenback stump.

"But when," said Mr. Urner, "a lot of us enthusiasts, despite the advice of cooler heads, insisted upon organizing a third party upon this issue, I can see very clearly that we really set back the movement we wanted to advance. The people were ready to think about the question, but they were not yet ready to leave the old parties and vote with reference to that alone. We had no prospect of immediate success, and so only a few of those who really believed with us were willing to 'stand up and be counted.' The consequence was that we polled a miserable vote; at the same time we made it impossible for men to openly express greenback views and remain in their old parties. Men of position, ability and influence, who up to that time had been advocating our principles, stopped and remained silent, leaving a few of us to make an independent struggle, so hopeless as to make our cause insignificant and throw on it in popular view the onus of crankism. I point with pride," said Mr. Urner, "to our greenback struggles; but to what purpose were they? A few local victories were won, always by alliances with our opponents. We did what a small political organization, acting independently, could do to arouse attention. But we became more and more insignificant, until now even the name of the party we hoped so much from is among the records of the past. It really hurt, not helped, the cause it was formed to serve—really deadened, by making it seem hopeless and ridiculous, the agitation we wanted to promote. But now that the greenback party has ceased to exist, the idea is already beginning to awaken among the old parties as the fear of odium is beginning to be lost."

Mr. Urner also went on to speak of the assertion sometimes made by those whose knowledge of the American political history is very vague, that the anti-slavery men gradually won their way by an independent movement in politics. "The truth is," he said, "that the real leaders of the anti-slavery struggle, such men as William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips and John G. Whittier, were steadily opposed to political movements, and that the third party movements which attempted to bring the anti-slavery struggle into practical politics were engaged in by men indocrinated with anti-slavery ideas, but impatient of what seemed to be their slow dissemination in the public mind—men so rash as to wish to begin the battle against disciplined hosts when they were but a bare handful of undisciplined enthusiasts. These third party movements really retarded instead of advancing the growth of the anti-slavery movement. The

republican party did not grow out of them, but out of the quiet permeation of anti-slavery sentiments through the elements of the old parties. And while they did something, perhaps, to advance the discussion in some ways, and by alliances in some localities with the old parties, elected some members of congress, they at the same time, stirred up party rancor and awakened a bitter opposition which made it inevitable that the evil of slavery could only be removed by violence and blood." And so, from what to him had been costly experience, Mr. Urner argued that it would be in the highest degree injudicious to attempt to organize a third party on the single tax principle so long as the majority of the people were not informed about it; as that would necessarily be to arouse prejudices, which would be most difficult to overcome, and to give it an appearance of ridiculous insignificance that would prevent men from seriously considering it. The history of our country, he said, gives no instance of a third party beginning small and gradually growing to be the leading party of the nation. On the contrary, parties which show themselves so small as to have no chance of success inevitably tend to become smaller.

I am inclined to think Mr. Urner right, and that both in the ways he pointed out and in the fact that small and insignificant parties attract ill-balanced extremists, the attempt to form an independent political party on the currency question has led to a widespread notion that any opposition to the existing financial policy of the government means a belief that wealth can be created and interest abolished by running enough printing presses on government notes. But the time is coming—and the changed attitude of the democratic party hastens it—when the whole question must be fairly discussed.

In the meanwhile everything goes to show that our principles, instead of being relegated to the background because there is to be no real attempt on the part of single tax men to go into independent politics this year, are really coming into wider and more general discussion. *Church Progress*, a Catholic paper published in St. Louis, is comical in its astonishment at this. "The calamitous defeat of the George party in New York last fall" and the "disruption of the party itself," all seemed, it says, "to clinch the popular belief that the land heresy had been interred as a dead and profitless hobby." But it complains that outpourings in the magazines and press "show that it has been dug out again and replanted as a perennial flower of controversy." And then the *Church Progress*, not to omit doing its share, goes on to devote its longest leader to the subject.

Our exchanges all indicate the same drift. The attention that the tariff controversy is beginning to call to matters of taxation is tending inevitably to show the absurdity and injustice of taxes upon the products of human labor, whether they are imported from other countries or produced here, and the dispute as to whether protection does or does not increase the wages of labor is bringing men to see on what wages really do depend—the terms on which labor, the active factor of production, can gain access to the passive factor of production, land. And not only in this country, but in other parts of the world, the great cause is moving on. Our struggle is confined to no one country, but is in reality a world wide fight in which whatever is done in one country reacts on the others.

HENRY GEORGE.

What Our Manufacturers Need.

From Congressman Mills's Speech. It is essential to the American manufacturer that he shall have a prosperous market in which there is a constant and active demand for his goods, and that he have such market both at home and abroad, so that his customers may be as many as possible, that they be constantly increasing in pecuniary ability so that they can pay largely and pay promptly for all they buy. These things being true, and his dependence on the export market on the home market, he should do everything in his power to help his customers grow in wealth. Who are his customers? The farmers. How are they to become prosperous and grow in wealth? By selling their products in the markets that demand them, and offer for them the highest price. Where are those markets? In foreign countries. But these markets are closed to him unless congress will let him bring back the goods he will obtain in exchange. If to-day the barriers against importation were broken down and our imports should increase from two to three hundred millions, that importation would create a demand for that amount of agricultural products to be exported to pay for them, and that would increase the price of farm products all through the land. It would distribute money among the whole sixty millions of people, placing a dollar beside every man, woman and child, which it could be satisfied. He would find that he had a market then at a far more valuable to him than it would be with the ten per cent of importations kept out and the prices of all farm products forced down so low that the farmers would have nothing with which to buy.

The Kind of Labor in Demand on the Pacific Coast.

New York Sun. Southern California is now the land of gold—for southern Californians. The richest gold mines in the state are the little six by eight offices, with a desk, a safe, a map, and a man of persuasive eloquence at the desk, between the map and the safe door. In Los Angeles county alone the real estate transfers have leaped from \$6,000,000 in 1882 to \$38,000,000 in 1887. In the same county the increase in assessed values of real estate for 1887 over 1886 was \$55,000,000, a gain which happens to be exactly equal to the total gold product of all California in either of those three golden years, 1855, 1856, and 1857.

STRAWS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

STRAWNS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

BETWEEN 1811 and 1850 over 9,000,000 people left Europe for America. Well, what of it? There is room enough for 90,000,000 more providing there is free access to natural opportunities.—[Detroit Advance.]

Whether Henry George is right or wrong in all his theories, our feeling is certain. The tariff would be all the burden of taxation would be beneficial to the mass of the working people.—[Clinton, Iowa, Labor Review.]

The fact is that the "pauper labor" of Europe is coming here to compete with the "pauper labor" in America, and at the present rate of immigration the "pauper labor" of Europe will soon be mostly transferred to our country.—[Telegram.]

During a recent eviction at Newcastle West, Ireland, one of the policemen on duty deliberately threw down his rifle, stating that he would not be a party to this belshish work, and that he would not help to exterminate and pauperize his own countrymen.

P. J. McGuire, grand secretary of the brotherhood of carpenters, declared to a large mass meeting of fellow craftsmen in Chicago, April 19, that the tariff did not protect the workmanship. It was organization, he said, that helped them keep up their wages.

Suppose the business men of Houston by their enterprise should extend the trade of their city and state boom in business, would it not be an advance and would not the merchants have to pay to landlords in the form of additional rents a large portion of the profits resulting from such boom?—[Houston, Tex., Labor Echo.]

It is not the tariff tax alone we ought to abolish. All indirect taxes are essentially the same; they all bear the stamp of oppression. We will not be a party to this belshish work, and that he would not help to exterminate and pauperize his own countrymen.

The workman does not believe in the taxation of anything that is the product of labor, as much taxation is always shifted in the final payment on the working classes to the consumers. Experience has proven that taxation of personal property is a failure and the laws passed governing such taxation are a waste of time and money. The tariff is a failure and all failures, dead letters.—[Grand Rapids Workman.]

Our wealth and prosperity are not attributable to our stores of iron and coal, our tillable fields and navigable rivers—the artificial bounties of nature made doubtfully fruitful by our own energy—but we build them up by our own industry, which we told the world to export for centuries, which blocks the wheels of trade and which in its present shape was reared upon us by the necessities of the civil world, is the source of our present greatness.—[Philadelphia Call.]

We believe that it is the duty of those who hold the destinies of the whole people, to agitate the public mind on the question of the tariff. It is part of the question until a public sentiment is created in its favor. Along with that agitation, we believe, should be considered as a means of bringing the result about, the question of taxing the value of the land which includes the substances in or under the land, which is the basis of all wealth. It is our duty to make the reform permanent.—[Commoner and Glassworker.]

Mr. Andrew Carnegie has rented Cluny Castle, Iverness-shire, Scotland. The tendency of the part of our rich citizens to rent castles and palaces in Europe suggests the idea that they should have more castles and palaces on this side of the water. Why should our rich citizens be obliged to travel to Europe for their castles and palatial luxuries? It is because they do not sufficiently encourage castle building for protection that the Wimaness, underbills and Carregies are forced to go abroad when they wish to escape baronial and feudal rule.—[New York Herald.]

This is the way that the single tax would succeed in the United States. Under our present system, a man who owns a half section of land upon which the tax is \$75, and one quarter is improved and the other is not, he who has improved his quarter pays about \$60 of the \$75, and the man who has made no improvement pays about \$15. Under the single tax system the man who pays \$75-50, because under the present system the man who does not improve does not pay at all. Will somebody who fears that the single tax on land values will bankrupt the farmer please explain how it could.—[Ceresco, Neb., Times.]

The land sharks of the west and south are rearing all sorts of highly colored inducements to come west where land is cheap. Texas is crowded with men and families who cannot raise the means to leave. Only this week I have seen 700 men and families who have no means to leave. They own one field of 40,000 acres, of land in one field they think of paying 50 to 150 per cent profit on what you buy and wearing your finger on the off to pay rent and interest on the land. They are getting away from Ohio and other states where not half of the land is used, because they can't get at it—in truth because their prejudice will not permit them to think of voting their own interest. Only think!—[Ohio Industrial News.]

Each farmer, on an average, produces enough to support five families, out of which lives a bare living for his own. What comes of the other four-fifths? It goes to the hands of the millionaires in Europe and in the east. It is taken from the farmer in excessive freights on all he sells or buys; in high taxes for useless and too highly paid officials; in the cost of all the bays caused by a tariff to protect useless manufactures; in the excessive interest on unnecessary public and private debts; in corners of all the necessities of life, which would be impossible but for our tariff and national banking laws, and in the hands of the few who own the great plantations shifted on him; while the great mass of the country is exempted from taxation.—[Hempstead, Tex., Advance Guard.]

The intelligent men are disposed, after reflection, to adopt the theory of the gradual improvement of the condition of the human race here on this earth by the operation of the known laws upon the progress of civilization. And if this is the case it must be by the gradual settling and the gradual improvement of the land. He is the destroyer of the whole idea of home and the greatest of selfish breeders. Think of one man owning the homes of a dozen other men as good or better than the fact that one man is receiving a penalty from them for the privilege of occupying a little piece of the surface of the earth that God gave as a common inheritance to all mankind. He is rightly named. He is a landlord; a land lord. There are some men better than he.—[Burlington, Iowa, Evening Star.]

CLIMAX OF REPUBLICAN TAX REVENUE.

The gentlemen who represent the minority on the committee on ways and means boast that the tariff and taxation \$90,000,000. They point with pride to the tariff and the duties which have been erected, but that the tariff has no stone in it to tell of their devotion to the masses who live by daily toil, but of blocks of marble, every one of which is a monument to the fact that the tariff is a means of privilege to rich and powerful classes. In 1883 they finished this magnificent edifice, which they have been for years erecting, and crowned it with the last stone by retaining the internal tax on playing cards and raising a twenty per cent tax on the bibb.

WAGES IN CALIFORNIA.

Over a hundred negroes with families, coming from North Carolina, have been placed in Fresno at \$15 per month, and they say there are many more in the south who would prefer to work in California to \$7 in their present homes.

THE STANDARD.

JERRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
2 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

TERMS: POSTAGE FREE.

One Year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.50; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient postage is sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscriptions in every portion of the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to change it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mail each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

A NEGRO'S INSPIRATION.

Bishop Hood of North Carolina has the right idea. Bishop Hood is an ecclesiastic of the Methodist persuasion and the African race, who recently delivered an address before the New York conference in which he proposed that the federal government should reimburse slave owners for the value of slaves set free at the close of the war.

At first blush, and without considering Bishop Hood's chief reason for it, the proposition seems preposterous. Many objections will at once arise.

In the first place, excepting a few localities, the slaves were emancipated as a war measure against an enemy. Just as forts were battered, cities burned and cotton confiscated, slaves were freed, to harass, weaken and subdue a rebellious people; and if the slave owners are to be compensated for their loss, why not the house owners and cotton owners for theirs?

Again, this is a question between the master and his slave. For a long time the master claimed the product of his slave's labor and the government enforced the master's claim; but since the middle '60s the government has refused to enforce the claim and the slaves have appropriated as much of the products of their labor to their own use as they could. It is true the masters have lost, during the past quarter century, a great deal of labor which the slaves might have done for them; but why should any one who never was a slave make up this loss to the masters? If the ex-slaves choose to do it no body will interfere. That is their right. It is also their right not to do it. Let the whole matter be settled between the real parties in interest.

Again, the masters lost nothing by the emancipation of the slaves. A slave was worth, say, \$1,000; but why? Simply because he could by his labor produce a certain value every year over and above his "keep," and that value, capitalized on the slave's probabilities of life, was about \$1,000. What the master lost, then, when the slave was freed, was not \$1,000 worth of property, but the chance of getting an annual percentage on \$1,000 during a series of years without working for it. Now, as any compensation for this prospective loss must be paid by people who work, out of the products of their work, the proposal to reimburse slave owners is in reality a proposal to transfer the masters' power from the black slaves of the south to all the tax payers of the country.

These objections, and many others that might be made, would no doubt be very forcible if they did not proceed from false premises. Or, rather, if they did not ignore the real reason for compensating slave owners. The reason was never suggested until Bishop Hood stated it as follows:

The negro would be benefited by the distribution of the money. The whites are actually too poor to employ labor at fair wages or to provide for the proper education of the negro.

This is simply unanswerable, as Judge Kelley and Mr. Randall will concede. And since these two members of congress are shining lights in the great opposing parties of the war, why cannot they compromise on some measure that will give effect to Bishop Hood's proposition? Judge Kelley, as a war republican, would naturally be averse to paying the southerners for their slaves; but as a protectionist republican, now that war issues are dead, he should subordinate his sectional prejudices. Mr. Randall has no such prejudices to overcome, and the united efforts of these two statesmen ought to be strong enough to win over a sufficient number of votes in congress to gladden the heart of Bishop Hood.

Just think of it! The whites of the south are too poor to employ negroes at fair wages; but if the old slave owners or their descendants were reimbursed the value of their emancipated slaves the south would be a blooming garden again. The whites would distribute the money among the negroes, and in return the negroes would pick their cotton, and hoe their sugar cane, and cook their dinners, and make their beds, and trim and decorate their grounds.

The only drawback would be the small amount of this money which the whites would have to distribute. Bishop Hood estimates the average value of the slaves at \$100. This would not amount to more than four hundred millions, and four hundred millions would not enable the whites to pay fair wages for a very long time. Still, that sum ought to last a year, and at the expiration of a year a similar ap-

propriation, to be followed by a similar distribution, might be made, and another the next year, and another the next, and so on. The second, third, fourth, and even the thousandth appropriation would be precisely as justifiable as the first. No one with a grain of sense would, as a matter of right or justice, have the slaves paid for out of the public treasury. It is only to enable the whites to employ the negroes at fair wages that the measure can be justified, and that justification attaches to any other appropriation as well as to this.

Nor is it necessary or desirable that this beneficent scheme should be confined to the south. It is not in the south alone that the whites are too poor to employ labor at fair wages. The same conditions exist in the north.

There is Pennsylvania, for example. Pennsylvania mine owners are so poor that they are able to pay miners only the lowest kind of wages; and for long periods, so pinching is their poverty, they cannot give them any work at all. And many of the mine owners are so hard pressed that to pay the wages they do they are compelled to set up stores for the miners to trade at, where the owners can somewhat ease the pressure upon them by inversely adapting the prices of the goods they sell to the wages they pay. Everything, except the application of Bishop Hood's scheme, has been done for Pennsylvania to modify the sufferings of these mine owners, but without avail. The reason that Bishop Hood's scheme has not been applied is probably because it has not been thought of. The miners were never owned by the mine owners, as the blacks of the south were by the whites. If they had been, and had been freed, so as to suggest compensation, the idea would have occurred, no doubt, to both Mr. Randall and Mr. Kelley. It is far more simple, a great deal cheaper, and certain to be more direct and effectual, than the complicated protective tariffs which these gentlemen have resorted to for the benefit of their mine owning constituencies. But now that Bishop Hood has thought of it, and he is entitled to no credit over Mr. Kelley and Mr. Randall, for it was the peculiar condition of things at the south that suggested it to him through the process known as association of ideas—why should it not be applied in Pennsylvania as well as at the south? Give to the whites of the south \$100 a year for every slave they used to own, and to the mine owners of Pennsylvania the same amount for every miner they employ, and the negroes of the south and the miners of Pennsylvania will be benefited by the distribution of the money, for the employers in both sections will no longer be too poor to employ labor at fair wages.

It need hardly be stated, for every intelligent reader will see it at a glance, that Bishop Hood's scheme is capable of indefinite extension within national boundaries. Just as it is proposed to pension the whites of the south to enable them to pay fair wages to the blacks, so, not only in the mining regions of Pennsylvania, but in all the cities and towns of the country, employers might be similarly pensioned for the same purpose and with like effect. Bishop Hood's idea is a genuine inspiration. Boldly applied, it will, in accordance with Professor Thompson's principles of political economy, make this the richest country in the world and its working classes the best paid and most contented people on the face of the earth.

A CASE FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT.
The New York Sun has a pain in its inside, which, all things considered, is perhaps not to be wondered at. But in place of consulting an expert authority as to the cause of its misery the Sun rashly attempts to diagnose its own disease, with the result that usually follows when a man undertakes to be his own professional adviser.

The Sun attributes its internal agony to sympathy for the poor workingmen. It thinks it sees all sorts of dreadful things hanging over them, and fancies it would feel better itself if only they could be induced to come in out of the rain and other dangers. It's the Mills bill, of course—the dreadful law that is to force the poor workingman to endure the indignity of being deluged with foreign-made pantaloons, and coats, and underwear, and stockings, and sugar, and everything else that he wants without the privilege of doing a stroke of work in return. The consequences will be as terrible as if Macy's, and Riddle's, and Ehrich's, and all the other big bazaar stores of New York should insist on distributing their goods among their customers without taking any pay. What woman could be expected to economize in her housekeeping if she could get a saskin sashie by asking for it? What man would maintain his habits of industry if he had only to go to the nearest store and get what he wanted for nothing? "It is killing," says the Sun. And then, with its hand upon its midriff, it gives this yawp of agony:

Brothers in the shops and factories, the final result of every free trade measure, if permitted to ripen, will be to transfer you and your industries to Europe—or to make you paupers and tramps in America. What are you going to do about it?

Ah well! we must be easy with the Sun, remembering all it has to suffer. It will know better when its pain subsides. The stomach ache is answerable for it all. Those wicked Europeans are unprincipled, of course, but they aren't absolute fools. When they deluge the American workingman with a clean pair of socks, they'll take fine care that the American workingman does some work to pay for them. They're not giving things away. That's

not their style. It is true they will exact less work in return for the socks than it would cost the workingman to make the socks himself; but even that wickedness can be overcome by prayer and persistent effort. The Mills bill may compel the workingman to take a pair of socks in return for fewer hours of toil; but even the Mills bill and the wicked foreigner combined can't prevent his keeping right on with his work and taking another pair of socks, or at the worst an undershirt, or something of that kind. Only the landlord can do that.

The Sun ought to take some medicine, apply hot fomentations, and go to bed. Its circulation has become sluggish, and these direful visions are the consequence.

THE SHEPARD AND THE SHEEP.

The Mail and Express begins the editorial page of one of its recent issues with the statement that the first man, Adam, became a living soul and the last Adam became a life giving spirit; and then goes on to explain at length that what the American descendants of Adam who live in the United States most need just now is a republican tariff policy. "A protective tariff," says the Mail and Express,

can only be rightly amended by a republican scheme of tariff reform which is made symmetrical, consistent and conservative, by reason of the constant devotion of its framers to the protected interests that are to be affected and to the interests of the people at large.

And then the Mail and Express explains that the proper way to amend the tariff is to let it alone and defeat the machinations of the British free traders by sweeping away the internal revenue taxes and getting rid of the horrid surplus in that way.

This is all very definite, and though it seems a rather narrow exposition of the scripture, it really does convey an idea of what the Mail and Express thinks we owe to ourselves and to the cause of religion. We must do all our own work, get rich by taxing ourselves, and have no dealings with the rest of the world. It's a perfectly straightforward and coherent programme.

But unfortunately the Mail and Express has a secular department as well as a religious one, and the utterances of the two are not always as harmonious as they might be. In the very issue which contains the sermon epitomized above, Mr. Shepard's news editor speaks approvingly of an effort that is being made to develop trade between the United States and the Argentine republic; and actually utters blasphemy against the sacred American sheep. "The Argentine republic, we are told," has 4,000,000 people, and any quantity of "horses."

They are extravagant buyers, and their trade would be worth at least \$1,000,000 a year to this city. In return there would be the Argentine wool, the production of which is the chief industry of the country. The number of sheep there is 90,000,000, and there is owned in the country the largest number of finely blooded rams known to civilization.

And the profane news editor points out the very simple means by which this flood of ninety million fleeces can be poured out upon us:

We want the duty to be ad valorem, not specific. That is all, and it is not asking much. This and a line of steamers to carry the mails to the most flourishing of the Spanish-American republics is what is suggested. Since 1825, I may say, the Argentine republic has been neglected by this country. Until now it is only by means of an occasional sailing vessel that trade is carried on between the two countries. But should there be better means of communication, everything manufactured here would find a market there.

Not asking much! Good heavens! The man deliberately proposes to take out the key-stone of the arch of protection, and then says he's "not asking much." The Mail and Express should either discharge its news editor or engage another divine to write its sermons. If things go on this way the sheep will indeed have lost their Shepard.

POST HOC ERGO PROPTER HOC.

The Textile Record for April undertakes to examine certain free trade theories in what it calls "the light of fact." But the protectionists' "light of fact" resembles nothing so much, in the illuminating order, as a jack of lantern in a bad state of health; and the Record makes no exception. Replying to the free trade contention that high wages are the result of superior skill, and that the English workingman does not dread cheap labor, but expert labor, it says:

A superior British workman holding such a strong position and receiving such high wages shows what, under the circumstances, may be regarded as a remarkable disposition to get away from his enviable position. There is a greater amount of immigration from the British islands than from any other country in Europe.

Without questioning the fact, or even calling attention to the oppression in Ireland which largely accounts for this emigration, what significance is there in the fact? If British workmen come here because we have a protective tariff, it is important, but that cannot be, for there is as high a protective tariff in Germany as here and a higher in Russia, and yet Englishmen do not emigrate to those countries. The Record concedes this by saying that they come here because wages are higher here than in England, and it might have added that they do not go to Germany or Russia because wages are lower there than in England. But why, it asks, are wages higher here than in England? That is a pertinent question. If wages are higher here than in England because we have a protective tariff and England has not, the Record makes out its case; but if that is not the reason, then whether free traders offer the true reason or a false one is immaterial. And yet the Record, while cautiously refraining from asserting that it is our protective tariff that makes

wages higher here, assails the assertion of free traders that the difference is due to the superior skill of American workmen. Of course it cannot attribute the difference to our tariff, for if protection made the difference wages would be higher, not only here but also in Germany and Russia, than they are in England, whereas the truth is that wages are lower in Germany than in England and lower in Russia than in either.

To say that our higher wages are due to superior skill is a partial statement. It is to superior and cheaper natural opportunities as well as to superior skill, and in greater degree to the former than to the latter that they are due. Make of England a continent like ours and emigration would flow from us instead of to us. But this aside, protectionists have only to show that emigration flows to protected countries because wages are high in protected countries. Why do they fail to do it? Why do they rest the case on their claims that it flows to one protected country because wages in that country are high? Why? Because there is only one protected country to which emigration flows and for which the claim of high wages can be made. And the reason of those comparatively high wages is clear. It is because that country is not yet quite all fenced in, and land is yet easier to get than in the countries from which emigration flows; and because, in addition, our federal system permits comparatively free trade over a vast area of country and among sixty millions of people. How little protection has to do with the movement, the Textile Record will understand if it will consider the case of Canada.

There is a country in which the Minabo Jumbo of protection is as ardently worshipped as in the United States. Yet not only does Canada fail to keep the immigrants whom she pays high prices to secure, but native born Canadians swarm over our border in such numbers that there are well nigh as many Canadians in the United States as in Canada itself.

The Ohio State Journal, an ardent devotee of the protection fetic, has this to say in criticism of the bill now before congress to distribute a lot of money among government employees who only worked eight hours a day and got less for doing it than other men who worked ten hours a day:

The passage of this bill is urged in the supposed interest of the working people of the United States. More than 55,000,000 persons in the United States are dependent for food, clothing and other necessities of life on the personal exertions of the working members of the families to which they belong. How, therefore, can the interests of "labor"—the interests of working people—be advanced by taking \$10,000,000, \$20,000,000 or \$50,000,000 of money belonging to the 55,000,000 and giving it to less than 100,000 persons who have been so fortunate as to be employed by the United States during the last twenty years at the highest rate of wages paid in the country?

There's a good deal of common sense in this argument, but there's mighty little "protection." However, Samson's riddle has as much force now as when the Philistines guessed it.

The Devoe manufacturing company, which is said to be one of the allies of the Standard oil company, is endeavoring to get through the legislature at Albany a bill to extend a portion of the bulkhead line of Long Island City nearly 150 feet into the East river. Curiously enough, the Devoe company owns all the land fronting on the proposed extension, and if the bill goes through it will acquire title to a strip 420 feet by 150 for the mere cost of filling in, added, of course, to the necessary expenses of legislation at Albany.

At the tariff debate recently held under the auspices of the Providence commercial club, at which Thomas G. Shearman utterly cleaned out Senators Chase and Aldrich, Mr. Shearman avowing himself an out and out, uncompromising, immediate, tariff abolitioner, claimed the authorship of the title "revenue reform," since he proposed that name at the first tariff meeting, because, as he said, "I wanted a good deal more than free trade." What Mr. Shearman wants is well known to the readers of THE STANDARD. He wants to abolish the tariff, to abolish all other forms of indirect taxation, and then to abolish all other taxes save a tax on land values. If this is what revenue reform means, it is a pretty good name.

The editor of the Laurel Review of Maryland, although he does not see the cat, hears its caterwaulings and flings a boot-jack out of the sanctum window into the dark, after this fashion: "Some of our property holders should be careful or they will drive prospective tenants away from Laurel. A grasping policy never pays; and it most assuredly does not pay a property holder to drive, by high rents, prospective tenants away from town." Indeed it does not pay, and it is worse for the business men of a town than for the land holders. If the editor of the Review will absorb himself in thought for a time he may see that a system of taxation which will compel land holders to rent on reasonable terms or let go of their land will be the very best system for Laurel. The single tax will do it. It will do more. It will offer the inducement to prospective tenants of exemption from taxation as well as low rents.

How Not to Do It.

The speaker of the British house of commons has found himself compelled to introduce an innovation into the methods of that august body. One of the honorable members, desiring to choke off another honorable member, who had introduced a motion that would make things uncomfortable for a third honorable member, moved the previous ques-

tion. Now, according to the old practice of the house of commons, "the previous question" was a curiously roundabout formality. When a member moved "the previous question" the issue put to the house by the speaker was "That the question be now put." The man who moved "the previous question" desired that the question should not be put at all. Consequently he voted no to his own motion, and if he had a majority the resolution of the house was that the question be not put, which is the object sought by moving "the previous question." But unluckily the motion for closure is in the form "That the question be now put." To avoid the confusion that would follow from employing the same formula for two motions of a diametrically opposite character, the speaker proposed an alteration that met with general approval. When the closure is moved the form of the question will be "That the question be now put." But when "the previous question" is moved the form will be "That the question be not now put." The result is that the house of commons has two methods of silencing a minority instead of one.

The War Industry is Encouraged.

RICHMOND, Ind.—Nothing is exempt from taxation in Indiana. Even the poor widow's cook stove must pay a tax or else be sold. Every male under a certain age must pay a poll tax, and if anyone is enterprising enough to cultivate a farm, build or improve a dwelling, or embark in business, the assessor takes it upon him as if he were getting too much and should be punished. I cite as an instance out of many: A workman bought a lot on the outskirts of our city for \$300, due at a certain time. On looking over the tax books he found that the lot had previously been assessed at \$30 valuation and paid each year 67½ cents thereon. But no sooner was the deed of the lot made over to him than the valuation was raised to \$175, and the first year he had \$4 in taxes. As he made improvements his taxes increased. On the adjoining vacant lots still held by the speculator were paid only a nominal tax; though their value was increased by reason of this man's enterprise.

We have a little knot of single tax men here who are sowing the seed. M. RITCHIE.

A Suggestion.

New York, April 22.—If the united labor party must take a hand in the next political contest—if it is imperative that they "stand up and be counted"—why shouldn't they nominate Mr. Cleveland as their standard bearer? "Cleveland and Mills" would be a strong ticket. True, neither of them endorses the Syracuse platform, but they are both bathing in waters wherein a land tax current is rapidly forming, and it would take but a very little to drag them into it. The ticket would not be elected, but Mr. Cleveland would, and the principles of the land tax party would be brought into prominent notice. Surely a half loaf is better than no loaf. I offer these suggestions for consideration by the Cincinnati conference.

WARREN JAMES.

Preached the Doctrine on the Cars.

OSHKOSH, Wis.—I am doing what I can to push the single tax doctrine wherever possible and am meeting with gratifying success. For instance, en route here our train was held some two hours at a little station in consequence of an accident, and I fell into a discussion of the single tax with an opponent of the principle, and soon had a long and pleasant forty, and entertained them with passages from "Progress and Poverty" and with comments.

Finally we took a vote and I was quite surprised to find fully three single tax men to one opposed. But I had to give up my "Progress and Poverty." I can seldom keep a copy through a hundred mile trip. I have met three or four solid crusaders here.

WM. SPALDING.

Taxing Slavery Out of Existence.

One of Erwin pasha's experiences in central Africa, as narrated in his recently published "Letters and Journals," is instructive. One of the problems that confronted him was the slave trade and how to put an end to it. He solved it, not by a decree of emancipation—which would probably have led to a bloody revolution—but by insisting that every man should announce the number of his slaves and pay taxes on them. Slavery and slave trading were soon rendered unprofitable, and it was not long before they became unpopular as well.

The Conservatives Were Too Strong for Him.

The recently deceased sultan of Zanzibar once paid a visit to Great Britain. Disraeli was prime minister at the time, and took advantage of the dusky monarch's presence to have a talk with him about the abolition of the slave trade, which was then one of Zanzibar's chief sources of revenue. It is said that the only time Dizzy was ever thoroughly taken aback was when the sultan answered his remonstrances with the announcement that he was very sorry, but—conservative party very strong at Zanzibar?

The South Brooklyn Single Tax Club.

This club meets every Tuesday and Friday nights at 253 Sackett street, when they read a chapter of "Progress and Poverty" and then discuss it. They are distributing through their district a prospectus of the club containing a number of quotations and inviting friends or opponents to come to their meetings and join in their debates. Their prospectus is ornamented by the striking cartoon, "An Object Lesson in Political Economy," originally printed in the Toronto Grip and afterwards republished in THE STANDARD.

Good News for the Bondholders Who Own Egypt.

Reports from Cairo state that the Egyptian cotton crop promises a better and larger yield than ever. Much more land has been sown than during the last season, and the plants are coming up in fine condition. The great overflow of the Nile last year immensely increased the fertility and area of soil suitable to the crop.

A Guaranty of Prosperity.

The land sale now in progress at Merced should reassure those persons who fear that a revision of the tariff may injure the fruit interests of the state. The capitalists chiefly interested in this sale are the members of the Southern Pacific company. Mr. Crocker and others have been at great expense in making the land marketable. The opening of their grand canal was a railroad event, celebrated by the entire force of railroad orators and journals.

This land is advertised as especially adapted to raising growing. It is sold upon the representation that the culture of raisins upon it will give the purchaser a competence. Some of the colonies into which it is divided are called distinctively "raisin colonies." The railroad men know whether these promises are true or false. They know whether the raisin business is what it is asserted to be, or whether it is a danger of extinction at any session of congress. It is not

likely that they would permit purchasers to buy their land under a mistaken impression. It happens that the railroad possesses the power of redeeming its promises whatever may be the effect of tariff legislation. Suppose the Mills bill should be adopted and should prove itself capable of devastating our vineyards, as its opponents say it will, word from Mr. Crocker could check the destruction. All that would be necessary would be a reduction of transcontinental freight rates. Ten cents a box taken off the duty and the same amount taken off his freight bill would leave the producer in a better position than now, for he would reach a wider market at the same net price. It is not to be supposed that the railroad would neglect so simple a means of making good its word. If it sells land to settlers upon the assurance that they can make raising growing pay it will not let raising growing cease to pay by its fault. Our producers may look with entire confidence upon the action of congress. Revenue reform will help them in most directions and there is a power that will keep it from hurting them in any.

An Anachronism.

Chicago Herald.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania was put forward as the champion of the single tax to answer the arguments of Mr. Mills, but he paid no more attention to Mr. Mills' speech than if it had never been uttered. He read a dissertation from manuscript on what he supposed would be the effect of the present bill, and he seemed to have collected it in some way with the slavery question, and that slavery could only be perpetuated by free trade. He called the bill an anachronism for that reason, but the truth is Mr. Kelley himself is an anachronism. He belongs to a different time and period from the present. He is an advocate of war taxes after the war is over, and goes back twenty-five and even thirty years ago for his arguments to support the slavery question. A century slavery may be considered as abolished, and it is now the desire of a people ambitious to be entirely free to abolish that infernal form of oppression and wrong—high tariff taxation.

Crowding Down the Prices of Our Own Products.

From Congressman Mills's Speech.
We are the great agricultural country of the world, and we have been feeding the people of Europe, and the people of Europe have got to give us in exchange the products of their labor in their shops; and when we put on excessive duties for the purpose of protecting the important interests of agriculture, a necessary result we put an excessive duty upon the exportation of our own agricultural products. And what does that do? It throws our surplus products upon our own markets. Some of them become glutted and oversupplied, and prices go down.

She Didn't Understand That the Law Paid Him for Living.

A prominent resident of Burlington, in making out his list for the assessors, put in his carriage horses at \$100 each. The gentleman's wife, when she looked over the list and saw the valuation put upon the horses, said: "Well, if those horses aren't worth more than that, I want a new span."—Burlington Free Press.

Liberty.

William Lloyd Garrison.
They tell me Liberty! that in thy name I may not plead for all the human race. That some are born to bondage and disgrace, 'Some to heritage of woe and shame, And some to power supreme and glorious fame.

With my whole soul I spurn the doctrine base, And as an equal brotherhood embrace. All people, and for all fair freedom claim! Know this, O man! what'er thy earthly fate—
GOD NEVER MADE A TYRANT, NOR A SLAVE: Woe, then, to those who dare to desecrate His glorious image—for all he gave Eternal rights, which none may violate; And, by a mighty hand, thy oppressor He yet shall save.

SOCIETY NOTES.

Little Miss May Sharpless, the nine-year-old \$9,000,000 heiress, is said to have an interesting collection of dolls, several of which cost over \$7,000.

Just now silver toilet articles are the rage, and for the sum of \$1,000 a very handsome set may be purchased in solid silver.—Mail and Express.

The number of grown women who sell newspapers on the streets is constantly increasing, and to-day there are eight of them, between thirty and fifty years of age, vending papers at the big bridge entrance and the immediate neighborhood. Some of them are assisted by little sons and daughters.

It is said that there are more than fifty widows in New York city possessing from \$1,000,000 to \$15,000,000 apiece.

Many laborers engaged in the furniture factories in Sturgis, Mich., though constantly at work, get insufficient pay to support their families and have to be assisted by the local relief and aid society. It was since without below the "life line," when the whole family is considered.

A Jew's harp, with a frame of gold and a silver tongue, is an oddity in scarf pins.

An effective novelty in brooches is a Berlin or black iron scroll, mounted with pearls and diamonds. It is suitable for half mourning wear.

A little two-roomed shanty at 108 Spruce street, Cleveland, Ohio, was visited by the authorities last week. An old couple named McMyler were found in one of the rooms in a starving condition. The old man had been sick and bed-ridden for six months, and his wife had supported both by washing until she became too sick and weak to work. In the room were found two old women suffering with disease and barely able to hobble around, who on a pile of rags in one corner lay a young woman with a new born babe in her arms. She had been delivered of the child two weeks ago, and had been there ever since without the attention of either a doctor or a nurse, and nothing to eat excepting the few crumbs that neighbors almost as poor as herself had brought in. She was the wife of a sailor, who deserted her. The starving families were taken in charge.

A beautiful hairpin recently observed was topped with a Maltese cross of matched and graded diamonds mounted on a coiled spring.

The amount which Mr. W. K. Vanderbilt is reported to have spent in old curiosity shops in Bond street is \$250,000.—London Echo.

The mausoleum which Senator Stanford is erecting in California will be in the form of a temple twenty-five feet square when completed. A double row of massive granite columns will support a roof of the portico at the front. The interior of the mausoleum will be finished in white marble. The mausoleum is erected to hold the bodies of only three persons—Senator Stanford, Mrs. Stanford and the late Leiland Stanford, Jr. The mausoleum will be finished during the coming summer.—New York World.

The sweating system in London produces fearful results. Mr. Lakeman, one of the factory inspectors, met a woman in the east end working for sixteen hours a day making waistcoat button holes at the rate of five for twopenny. In fur cape making a woman said: "I work from 8 to 5, and earn five shillings a week, sometimes less. I have nothing to do for six months in the year." In the east end, and even in central London, for the lowest class of men's shirts, sold wholesale at thirteen shillings and sixpence, the work is remunerated in one penny a dozen by machine work and threepence a dozen for button holes and buttons. A woman by close application may make a dozen shirts a day, and thus painfully earn six shillings a week; the finisher must be contented with three shillings.

Every only tax Dirt is a cord's h evil uni and egg us to ex There is thing is Even covered been as with th in time to prote mists, it was a n inasmuch sums s the own aver to good an bills, it a navy, better allowed houses, men co away in whole, t the nav sailor's, —if it w —d it w But n navy is fit out. Canada been at problem is to act ing place The a of his e plete su at Pens officers, to the drills, machin inspecti dinners one else with a camp f up, just July. Pensac smashin they in show w weather Fortres and oth West of And I nural I actually along t of hotel forman which i nopolis commu every s make e But c loved t pents i nothing all rigi admirat may dr the mo There commit represe It emac law shi "no co port at seled a land ca to a free of Shou will be and ter the Pa charges import cago ar The ridged ding for the An selves t advant both a change nears Ameri no us the Cal ing sh really r people haps i tionist least v then t to red to lev In eith citu ra should The pre ping of for An enligh stroy c transp still, b unquie The C built i reason protect more e It w that t acted dis-tin house recom is a va that t buy a marke long a carry

MEN AND THINGS.

Everything has its uses, if men will only take the trouble to find them out. Dirt is only matter out of place. All discord, harmony not understood, all partial evil universal good, and out of the acid and agglutination of our science teaches us to extract the eye pleasing aniline dyes. There are sermons in stones, and everything is good for something.

Even the United States navy has discovered its uses. Thoughtless people have been asking for years what we wanted with the navy, anyhow. It was of no use in time of peace, and it would be difficult to protect in time of war. Some economists, indeed, pointed out that the navy was a useful annex to the protective tariff, inasmuch as it enabled very considerable sums of money to be distributed among the owners of ship yards; the obvious answer to which was that while that was a good argument in favor of appropriation bills, it was no argument at all in favor of a navy, since the country would be much better off if the ship yard men were allowed to spend their appropriations in houses, and horses, or something else that men could use, instead of frittering them away in building ships of war. On the whole, the best that men could say for the navy of the United States was the sailor's criticism on the chips in his burgoo, "if it was no d—d great good, it was no d—d great harm."

But now at last we really know what the navy is good for. Admiral Luce has found it out. He commenced experimenting in Canadian waters months ago, and he's been at it ever since. Now he's solved the problem. The true function of the navy is to act as an attraction for seaside watering places, just like the sea serpent.

The admiral has just completed the first of his exhibitions, and it has been a complete success. He assembled a squadron at Pensacola, landed most of the men and officers, and for a number of days offered to the public a succession of battalion drills, target practice with small arms, machine guns and howitzers, sham fights, inspections, dress parades, athletic sports, dinners and hops. One night while every one else was fast asleep, he went ashore with a Gatling gun, and played upon the camp for half an hour, waking everybody up, just as if it had been the Fourth of July. The hotels have been crowded, the Pensacola boarding houses have done a smashing business, and everybody agrees they never saw anything like it. The show will move northward with the warm weather, and during the season will visit Fortress Monroe, Newport, Bar Harbor and other fashionable resorts. The Wild West of Buffalo Bill was nothing to it.

And let nobody say that in all this Admiral Luce is acting frivolously. He is actually creating wealth. As he moves along the coast he will increase the value of hotel sites wherever he halts for a performance. And it is a well known economic principle that the higher the value which land owners set upon their monopoly the greater is the wealth of the community. If the admiral keeps going, every summer resort along the coast will make enough to build a new poor house. But of course the thing must not be allowed to become too common. If sea serpents were as plenty as eels they'd be nothing but a nuisance. A little navy is all right; but if we lose too many admirals, the rattle of their Gatling guns may drive the seaside guests back into the mountains.

There is a little bill in the hands of the committee on commerce of the house of representatives that will bear watching. It exacts that the interstate commerce law shall be amended by a provision that "no common carrier shall receive or transport any goods, wares or merchandise in sealed cars or in bond, by railroad or other land carriage through any foreign country to any other place in the United States free of duty."

Should this bill become a law, its effect will be not only to place the Pacific states and territories completely at the mercy of the Pacific roads in the matter of freight charges, but to shut out of the market an important competitor for freights to Chicago and points west.

The Canadian Pacific road, heavily subsidized by its government, has been bidding for the Pacific trade at rates which the American roads have professed themselves unable to meet. This is a distinct advantage to producers and consumers at both ends of the line. It facilitates exchange, and practically brings the Atlantic nearer to the Pacific. If it be true, as the American railroad managers assert, that no unsubsidized road can afford to meet the Canadian Pacific's rates, then by sending shipments through Canada, we are really exacting tribute from the Canadian people—a thing immoral in itself, perhaps, but not at all discordant to protectionist principles. If, however, as is at least very possible, such is not the case, then the effect of such shipments is simply to reduce the power of the American roads to levy tribute on American production. In either case the privilege of using Canadian railroads is one of which Americans should refuse to be deprived.

The protectionist argument in favor of the proposed legislation is that by shipping over American roads we make work for American citizens. According to this enlightened logic it would be well to destroy every railroad in the country, since transportation by wagon train, or better still, by wheel barrow or portage, would unquestionably make vastly more work. The Chinese destroyed the first railroad built in their country for precisely that reason. But then the Chinese understood protection better than we do, and have more of the courage of conviction.

It would perhaps be too much to expect that the Dunn free ship bill should be enacted into law, but it certainly marks a distinct advance that a committee of the house of representatives is bold enough to recommend its passage. And yet the bill is a very modest one. It merely provides that the American citizen who wants to buy a ship shall be allowed to go to market and buy her, and to keep her as long as he is good and doesn't use her to carry things from one part of the United

States to another, in which case she is to be taken away from him by a justly offended government. Or if the citizen feels like building his ship here, the bill permits him to go to market and buy the things to build her with. In that it simply confers on Americans a portion of the natural rights possessed by natives of the west coast of Africa, and to that extent raises them in the scale of independence and civilization. We shall get to the level of Dahomey by and by.

Senator Stanford is a generous minded man. He remarked to the editor of the Washington National Republican the other day: "I believe in doing everything possible for the improvement of Washington. The country is rich, and we can afford to spend some of our surplus money on our capital."

The Republican says of this utterance that it has the true ring:

It is the broad, unselfish view of a man who has done more perhaps than any other one man to enrich this country. His personal interests are not immediately connected with Washington, but he looks at the question from the standpoint of a citizen of the republic, who feels that Washington belongs to the nation, is the nation's ward, and that the nation's greatness is in a manner judged by the character and appearance of its capital.

There is a good deal that might be said about Senator Stanford's affection for Washington and the National Republican's appreciation of it. But perhaps, on the whole, it isn't necessary to say it. Readers of THE STANDARD will have no trouble in framing criticisms for themselves.

An enterprising German brought to New York the other day, from across the Atlantic, a troupe of monkey actors. Before a monkey of them was allowed to come ashore, a duty of twenty per cent was exacted, and invoices and bills of sale of the various members of the troupe were gravely examined and verified by the collector of customs, with a single eye to the interests of the United States.

This duty upon performing monkeys is one of those things that no fellow can understand. Why is it levied? Whom does it protect? The American actor? He holds his own against the pauper actors of Europe, who are imported duty free, and surely feels no competition from the monkey tribe. The breeders of monkeys? They're like the snakes in Ireland—there aren't any. The question is not to be answered. Probably it's like a good many other questions about the tariff. It's impertinent to ask it.

The clergy of St. Paul, Minnesota, held a meeting lately to consider what they should do about revival services. Dr. Munhall, who is described by the St. Paul Globe as a "speaker of great power, having a remarkable acquaintanceship with the bible and a rich vein of genuine humor," spoke strongly in favor of arousing an interest in religion. "The town," he said, "needs such a movement as this more than anything else. It'll boom the town so that you will go ahead of Minneapolis so far that the people of that place can't see you. A great movement such as this promises to be well better for you than twenty blast furnaces and a dozen railroads."

Well, there is no doubt that if one people of St. Paul could be persuaded to follow the teachings of Christ—to obey the golden rule, and take no thought for the morrow, and go two miles with the man who asked them to go—one they would get pretty far ahead of Minneapolis. But it is to be feared that the reverend Dr. Munhall didn't mean anything of that kind.

The march of improvement along the west side of this city has been checked north of Central park. Where less than a year ago buildings were going up as if by magic, and streets were unrecognizable by any one after a week's absence, houses are standing half finished, stores are vacant and flats are difficult to let. A local season of depression has set in.

Of course the landlord is ready with his explanation. Over production is the trouble. There has been altogether too much building, and the result is that there are more houses than people to occupy them. It's a very simple matter—from the landlord's point of view.

But to any one who will take the trouble to look beneath the surface, it becomes quickly evident that there is some other cause at work besides the surplus of houses and the scarcity of people to live in them. Indeed, it is evident that there must be some other cause. A man need only canvass the circle of his own acquaintance to learn that there are any quantity of people who would like exceedingly to live in Harlem, only—only—they can't afford to. So they keep on moving themselves up in flats that are little better than tenement houses, and tenement houses that are little better than sties, while west side Harlem houses stand vacant, and west side Harlem lots go unused.

Half a generation ago, Harlem was a pretty suburban village where men who would submit to the inconvenience of a long ride night and morning, found pleasant, comfortable homes, within the limits of an ordinary American citizen's means. People used to wander out there Sunday afternoons and say regretfully: "What a delightful place this would be to live in, if it were only a little more accessible." And so when the elevated railroads came along, everybody welcomed them, and urged their speedy building, and spoke hopefully of the good time coming when every New Yorker should have a home of his own, with a private vine and fig tree blooming in the back yard.

Well, the elevated railroads have been with us for ten years, but the separate homes, and the vines, and the fig trees have somehow moved a little farther off. They're in Westchester county now, a little more inaccessible than ever, and the air is full of new rapid transit plans to bring them within our reach. The people who have benefited by having Harlem made accessible have naturally been the people who own Harlem; and the reason for the stagnation in house property in Harlem is simply that the owners of Harlem are trying to benefit too much. Tax Harlem land values out of sight, and

within a year there wouldn't be a vacant lot or house to be found there.

It's astonishing what an amount of sympathy there is for dwellers in tenement houses. Small parks are to be provided for their recreation, model tenement houses are built for their use, and here is the legislature of New York meditating the passage of a bill to authorize and require the board of health to enter any tenement house and put it into such complete sanitary condition as it hath not entered into the mind of man to conceive. Then, of course, everybody will be happy and the social problem will be in a fair way to be solved.

It doesn't seem to occur to our legislators that it might, on the whole, be a good thing to so arrange matters that people shouldn't be compelled to live in tenement houses. It would be easy enough. But of course it would involve irreligious interference with the vested rights of individuals to control the use of the earth which God made for men—even tenement dwellers—to live on.

Nine thousand human lives is the yearly sacrifice that our tenement house population offers—so the board of health informs us—upon the altar of private land ownership. Most of them are children, it is true, and belong to the lower classes. But there was a Man once who spoke quite pityingly of the little ones and seemed to think that on the whole they might be worth saving.

The clergy of Fifth avenue are disquieted lest stages be run along that street on Sunday, and in the advertising columns of the Mail and Express, a semi-religious daily of this city, they print a humble petition to the stage company to keep their horses in the stable and give their employees a rest on the Lord's day. This ought to be done, they tell the stage company, because Fifth avenue "is peculiarly a street of churches and homes," and both should be protected.

Here we have a pretty good opportunity to judge what men like the Reverend Howard Crosby, and the Reverend Edward Walpole Warren, and the Reverend R. S. MacArthur, and the Reverend John Hall consider to be a "home." Evidently it is not merely the place where a man lives with his family. Because, if that were so, a single block of Avenue A would have well nigh as many homes on it as the whole of Fifth avenue; and the reverend gentlemen would be doing their utmost to turn the tide of Sunday travel into the last named thoroughfare, so as to secure a Sabbath stillness for the east side avenues. The "homes" which Dr. MacArthur and his co-petitioners are troubled about are those in which one family occupies one house and enjoys a proper degree of privacy and comfort.

The reverend gentlemen convey a truth which they had no thought of uttering. The majority of residents of this city have no homes. The vast majority of the coming generation of New Yorkers will have no conception of the meaning of the sacred word. To them the song of John Howard Payne will be simply a string of idle words set to a rather pretty tune.

It is pleasant to see the clergy anxious for the preservation of the few homes that remain to New York's citizens. But if they would examine matters a little more closely they would discover that Sunday stages are not the worst enemies of home life, and they might at the same time learn why it is that the avenue on which our wealthiest citizens live is also "peculiarly a street of churches."

A report comes from Chicago that Inspector Bonfield, who has taken charge of the detective department of that city's police, proposes to discharge half the regular detectives and spend the money that is saved in paying temporary spies among all the criminal classes, who shall be discharged as soon as their connection with the department is known. It is to be hoped for the credit of American institutions that the report is false.

Our police methods have already too much tendency to encourage the manufacture of crime. Officers who make the most arrests are generally deemed most worthy of promotion; and in the detective branch the chief test of merit is far too apt to be the number of convictions secured. We have imitated Russia so far as to make the police headquarters of a large city a sort of miniature Petropavlovsky fortress, to which persons under suspicion are secretly conveyed, and in which they are detained in defiance of law and tempted to confess by ingenious mental torture. We may as well stop there. To adopt the Russian system of police agents will only be to breed secret plotters against society. Like causes produce like effects.

The Philadelphia Record states that the iron manufacturers of the Lehigh and Schuylkill valleys are complaining bitterly of the treatment they get from the railroads and coal companies with which they do business. Not only are they charged heavy freights on their product, but they are made to pay exorbitant prices for the coal they use. The Record quotes one of them as saying:

There can be no doubt of the justice of our demands, and every day brings fresh instances of an unjust discrimination against the iron trade. Why, we have direct information that the Lehigh valley coal company has made a contract with the elevated roads of New York to furnish them with furnace coal at a price that will net them but \$1.60 at the mines. The same coal is sold to the iron men at \$2.25 per ton at the mines. Our request for \$2 coal does not seem unreasonable in view of this fact.

It isn't likely that they can appreciate the fact as yet; but it can do no harm to point out to these complaining makers of iron that one effect of taxing land values only would be to prevent the coal monopolists playing games of this kind. But though the iron men may not see this fully, they can't help noticing that the protective duty on coal doesn't by any means stimulate production, either of coal or iron.

A Chance for the Poets.

Tax reform club No. 21 of Houston, Texas, has offered prizes for the best songs composed on the subject of tax reform, as follows: For the first best, \$750; for the second best, \$50; and for the third best, \$250.

FOREIGN NOTES.

Many people think England is a country of free trade—that a man there has a right to buy where he pleases and sell where he likes, without asking permission from anybody. That's a mistake.

The city of London, for example, has by sanction of law, built an invisible fence around some 700 square miles of territory, within which limit she levies a special tax on coal and wine—a tax which brings in some hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly. Just now there is a bill before parliament, not to abolish this tax—bless you! nothing of that sort—but to keep on collecting it, and then divide it among the various local authorities of the taxed district in proportion to population, thus making the steel appear less burdensome to the people, and at the same time providing for the officials who do the collecting.

But the funniest case is that of the town of Inverness in Scotland. Inverness, it seems, has a right to exact certain "petty customs,"—a regular little protective tariff for the benefit of its own industries. For some years past these customs have been somewhat relaxed, and only enforced in cases of large importations; but the town council are now considering the propriety of enforcing them in full. Here is an account of what this would mean, in the words of ex-Bufile Macintosh to his fellow town councilors:

For example, farmers and dairymen, in bringing milk into the burgh, were liable in customs. All letters and newspapers brought into the burgh were liable in customs. Every railway carriage and every railway truck that came into the burgh, not passing through in transit, was liable; passengers traveling by rail and coming into the burgh were liable to payment on their personal luggage. A striking case was that of the tenant of the farm of Headfield. A part of his land was in the ancient royalty, the steading, and another part was beyond the parliamentary boundary. Every time this farmer carted kummers from his steading to his fields in the ancient royalty, he was liable in customs at the rate of 3d. per barrel bulk. Every time he drove his cattle, for instance, his milk cows that might require to be sent into these fields daily, he was liable in customs at the rate of 4d. on each, and every time he took an empty cart from his steading into the roadway that adjoined his steading, he was liable in customs at the rate of 3d. per barrel bulk. He would ask in the name of common sense, was it practical to exact the full schedule rates. (Hear, Hear.)

Queer, how this protection craze involves absurdity wherever one encounters it. Here in the United States we have protected our fishermen out of existence, and have to send to Canada for men to man our fishing boats; and in Inverness the same principle threatens to compel an innocent farmer to leave a portion of his land uncultivated.

John Bright's speech at the Chamberlain banquet at Birmingham has attracted much attention. He said it was a sensible wish on the part of the Canadians that the barriers between them and the United States should be thrown down. Economical facts pointed to a tendency to get over the sentiment that it was better for Canada to be associated with Great Britain than with the United States. He declared that the scheme of a federation of Great Britain and her colonies would never be carried, and never ought to be carried, so long as the mother country clings to her present war policy. "If I were a Canadian," said Mr. Bright, "or a Victorian, or New South Wales man, or Queensland, or New Zealand, I would take good care, as far as I was concerned, that my voice should never go in favor of the policy of the old country as far as that was concerned. It would be much better for humanity and for us that these colonies should be under governments of their own and independent, and should not enter into quarrels in which they were not concerned, but endeavor to maintain their own honor and not take part in the miserable quarrels, contests and wars which for a long time past have disgraced the history of the kingdom in which we live."

Wherever a landlord is, there "protection" is tolerably sure to be also. The two naturally go together. The English landlord is denied the benefit of a tariff wall, but he gets "protection" in other ways.

The English rural landlords own all the English partridges—quite naturally, for partridges can't live without land—and derive no small income from the sale of the birds shot by themselves and their guests. This traffic has been interfered with by the importation of Russian partridges which are sold at moderately reasonable prices—twenty or twenty-five cents each. So the other day a dealer was arrested, charged with having partridges in his possession after the legal shooting season had expired. He proved that they were Russian birds, caught in Russia during the winter and preserved by freezing, but that made no difference—the partridges were confiscated and the dealer fined. The landlord view is that if Russian trappers cannot sell their birds in England during the close season they will cease shipping them altogether.

There is no false modesty about the English landlord. He owns the earth and claims every right that that ownership implies. He not only refuses to allow his fellow mortals to utilize the earth for wealth production—to dig things out of it, or plant things in it, or build things on it—but he isn't even willing that they should look at it without his leave first asked and given. The lakes of Cumberland, the bays and lochs of Scotland, the rugged mountains of Wales, may not be looked at by the tourist save as he can see them from the high road or by permission of some lord of the soil. On many a pleasant little river or lake no boat may float, except the boat of the "proprietor," and as the trespasser is generally brought for punishment before the very landlord on whose earth or water he has been standing or floating the lot of the trespasser is apt to be hard indeed.

There is a bill now before the British parliament designed to rob the landlords of a small portion of their vested rights in scenery and air. It provides that within the limits of the principality of Wales, and within those limits alone, the public shall have right of access "to mountain

land, moor or waste land, and access to, and power to walk along, the bed or bank of any river, stream or lake, or to ride in any boat, coracle or canoe upon any river or lake, for the purposes of recreation, 'wimberly' gathering, scientific inquiry, sketching or antiquarian research." Land under cultivation, orchards, gardens, even timber land are excepted, and streams that run through "private domains" are still to be sacred. And woe betide the geologist or botanizer who meddles with rock or flower. For such the prison doors are still agape.

Of course the bill will not be passed. Even Mr. Ellis, who introduced it, has no hope of that. The landlords stigmatize it as a scheme of robbery, and the landlords are still powerful in Britain. But it is noteworthy that many papers of the "better class" speak of it as a thing that must be done some day, and admit that Mr. Ellis has a certain amount of reason on his side.

The enthusiasm of the French people for General Boulanger would be laughable did it not involve the possibility of such terribly grave results. Here is a man who has achieved popularity by sheer indefiniteness—declining to state his views or intentions in any save the most general terms and leaving his worshippers to fill in the blanks, each according to his own wishes. Is he anxious for a war with Germany? Some say yes; some no. The general himself gives sphinx like answers that may be interpreted either way. What is his immediate programme? The revision of the constitution. "May I venture," said an English correspondent, "to ask what is your idea of a revision of the constitution?" "That is my secret. I keep it to myself. That is my policy." And so it goes.

The gravest sign of the weakness of the republican sentiment in France is the willingness to worship a veiled prophet chiefly because he is veiled. Whether Boulanger be destined to achieve the success his admirers hope for or not is a matter of comparatively trifling importance. The significant thing is that the majority of a great people seem inclined to allow a single man to do their thinking for them, and to do it, too, without telling them what he thinks.

Mr. Bradlaugh has given notice of his intention to move the following resolution in the house of commons on the 1st of May:

That, in the opinion of this house, ownership of land should carry with it the duty of cultivation or utilization, and that in all cases where land capable of cultivation or utilization with profit, and not devoted to some purpose of public utility or enjoyment, is held in a vacant, waste or uncultivated state, the local authorities ought to have the power to compulsorily acquire such land by payment to the owner of a sum representing the capital agricultural value of such lands, in order that such local authorities may, in their discretion, let the said land to tenant cultivators, rent, reclamation, drainage, utilization, and cultivation respectively as shall afford reasonable encouragement, opportunities, facilities, and security for the due utilization, cultivation, and development of the said lands.

The resolutions will probably not be adopted. But it is safe to say that their discussion will do much to set Englishmen thinking on the land question even harder than they are thinking now. Mr. Bradlaugh will succeed in putting the landlords on their defense; and when they once seriously try to explain why they claim a right to tax their fellow men, the end is not a great way off.

Another significant circumstance is the appearance of the following clause in a bill "to facilitate the better housing of the working classes in London," now under consideration:

In all cases in which land available for building within the metropolitan area is not built upon, or only partially built upon, so much thereof as is not built upon shall be rated as if its net annual value were equal to four per cent upon that sum which the land would sell for at the date of such rate being made. If such land is unsaleable, it shall be rated as provided by the existing law.

The same bill contains the following section in reference to the manner in which the compensation for land taken under the provisions of the bill shall be fixed:

The artisans' and laborers' dwellings improvement acts, 1875 to 1885, are hereby amended as follows: that is to say:

(1) In deciding the amount of compensation payable to any claimant the arbitrator shall not pay any regard to prospective or contingent increase of value; and, in the case of any dwelling house, shall not estimate the rental at any sum greater than the sum which the house or the several tenements therein would in his opinion, let for, if not overvalued.

(2) No sum shall be awarded by an arbitrator on account of good will or loss of trade profits if, in the opinion of the arbitrator, the claimant can obtain in the immediate neighborhood premises suitable for his business.

(3) No appeal to a jury shall in any case lie from the award of an arbitrator.

Of course, these sections are far from involving anything more than the merest approach to the principles of the single tax on land values. Had they done so, it would probably have been impossible to get them seriously discussed, or even introduced. As it is, their discussion will inevitably tend in the direction of the single tax. The landlords cannot claim that any injustice is done by taxing their estates on the basis of what the land might produce if put in use, without asserting, in plain, unmistakable terms, their right to treat their land as they see fit—to use it or leave it idle, as they prefer. Nor can the friends of the bill meet the landlords' argument, save by the claim that private property in land is not a right to be asserted, but an evil to be endured, and to be endured just so long and to such an extent as the people choose, and no longer and no further. The compensation clauses, too, involve the question of the landlords' right to the unearned increment; and it is to be expected that one side will attack that right and the other defend it with a vigor which will quickly drag the basic principles of private land ownership into the discussion.

Thus, from different points, the two great English speaking nations are mustering for the struggle for industrial emancipation. Here the tariff inquiry seems

likely to provoke the discussion. In England it bids fair to come about through the tory landlords' anxiety to keep the starving poor quiet by providing them with decent sleeping places.

A Photographer Wants Some Toys.

Why are you so persistent in opposing protection to American industry? What we really need is not less protection, but more. Take my case. I am a photographer. I have to pay more for many of the materials used in my business than I would have to pay if it were not for the tariff. Of this I do not complain, for I know that in paying more for my materials I am helping American industries. For instance I use a good deal of glass, which costs me more on account of the tariff. Well, that is good for glass makers, and I do not begrudge the extra cost. But what I do complain of and what I have a right to complain of is that I am not protected in my business. The business is being ruined by amateurs. These people go around taking pictures for fun or at such a price that I can't compete with them. It isn't fair. I pay my taxes and I ought to be protected. I have no doubt there are a good many other industries just like mine, whose toys have to pay protective duties and are not themselves protected. If you would turn your attention to this subject you might do some good. It is not by taking the tariff off of glass that you will benefit photographers, but by putting a protective tariff tax on amateur photographers. And that is the way with everything. Business men will be glad to pay high prices for their materials in order to protect the manufacturers; all they ask in return is to be protected from amateurs. You do not seem to understand the tariff question. I would advise you to read the Press. Before that paper came out I was all in a fog about the question, but now it is perfectly clear to me.

T. B. JOHNSON.

Manufacturers Who Don't Like the Tariff.

Congressman M. H. Ford of Michigan recently presented a petition signed by 140 furniture manufacturers of fourteen different states, representing \$10,000,000 of capital and employing 24,000 men, asking that coal, barbed wire, German looking glass plates and sponges be placed on the free list. The petition says: "The collection of duties on these articles does not benefit any industry in this country, but is a grievous burden to furniture manufacturers, and if our petition is granted it will divert from the national treasury \$3,575,805 annually and will save this amount and many millions more to the people."

THE BEATING OF THE DRUMS.

How the Two Great Parties are Mustering for the Tariff Fight.

The tariff law is no longer in aid of the beginnings of great industries, but in maintenance of vested interests and of high wages for the workmen. (Mail and Express.)

That there is nothing that will kill protectionism so quickly as discussion ought to be evident to every man who has just confidence in the intelligence of the American people. (Richmond Star.)

In Scotland there are 1,000,000 tons of pig iron which the holders are keeping to dump upon our shores as soon as the free traders carry their ends in regard to the tariff. (St. Joseph, Mo., Herald.)

The fact that the different sections of our country, with their differing wage rates, get along prosperously without any trade barriers between them is a fact worth thinking about. (Providence Journal.)

Every man in the country who favors the American system understands the advantages which protection gives to every citizen—should exert himself in behalf of the most righteous cause that has existed since the armies of Washington drove the English free traders from American soil. (Washington Republican.)

The wage workers of the country are fast beginning to realize the fact that all the boasted protection to American labor that we are said to be getting now through a high tariff is a delusion and a snare. Wage workers do not want a protection that simply protects and enriches big monopolists. (Minersville, Pa., Free Press.)

What a great thing this protection is. It enables every body who has anything to sell to get high prices for it, but everybody who has anything to buy can get it at extremely low prices, or, in other words, we buy at low prices of people who sell at high prices, and we sell at high prices to people who buy at low prices. (Ceresco, Neb., Hus.)

According to the census of 1880 the average wages of the unskilled railroad employes was \$3.50 a year, while the protected iron workers averaged only \$3.12. Do miners and smelters get higher wages than the bricklayers? Do skilled workers in cotton and woolen mills receive more than the carpenters? Every one knows that they do not, but that on the contrary, their earnings are much less. How then do these high taxes benefit labor? It is an undisputed fact that workers in silver mines are much better paid than the men who deliver iron, yet on iron there is a high protective tariff while in silver there is absolute free trade. (Philadelphia Call.)

The following passage appears in the call of the Wisconsin republican state committee for a convention to choose delegates at large to the national convention: "All voters who oppose the doctrine of free trade as un-American and dangerous, and who favor such protection to American industries as will yield a fair return to capital and liberal wages to labor, and who favor a reduction of internal taxes, a wise revision of our tariff laws, and reduction of taxation on imports, placing on the free list, as nearly as possible, the necessities, and making the luxuries of life the province of government, are invited to join in the election of delegates to this convention."

England will not go back to protection for the purpose of securing an addition to the prosperity of her people, for the reason that her people know that such a change might be good for the classes, but would surely be most injurious to the masses. There will be changes in England's policy as soon as the enfranchised democracy learn to know their power, and the tendency will be toward greater freedom of trade and not toward restriction. Protective duties might increase rents, but they could not raise wages, make employe in plentiful or add to the profits of industry and enterprise. Badly off as some of the English people are to-day, they were far worse off under the old fiscal system which received its death blow in 1846. (Hamilton, Ont., Times.)

Figures That Tell the Story.

From Congressman Ellis's Speech.

I have here a letter from the chief of the bureau of statistics, which shows that in 1880 with a low tariff the consumption of domestic manufactures in the United States was \$8,839 per cent of the whole, and of imports 11.61 per cent. In 1891, with a still lower tariff, our home manufactures constituted 87.57 per cent, and the consumption of imports was 12.43 per cent. In 1870 the consumption of domestic manufactures was 92.14 per cent, and 6.96 per cent of imports, and in 1880 were consumed 92.38 per cent of home manufactures, and 7.62 per cent of foreign manufactures. Now, it is evident from these figures that under any circumstances we can hold 90 per cent of the market against the world. If we had no tariff, if all the custom houses were torn down and the government was supported by direct taxation, more than 10 per cent of all the manufactured products consumed by all the people would be imported into the country.

The Roaring of the Sea.

Charles Mackay.
 "I could see a snow white head,
 "I cannot see my way," he said.
 "All things are out of gear and line,
 Men worship money, their only god;
 Each thinks himself alone divine,
 And tramples his neighbor to the sod.
 Ever the weakest goes to the wall;
 None of us know what the end shall be,
 Except that misery must befall—
 We hear the roaring of the sea."

"I asked of one that seemed a king
 Why to the shadows he seemed to cling,
 Shadows behind and shadows before—
 He answered sadly, 'Ask me not.
 I strive to follow my father's trade
 I walk as I may—or can—God wot—
 Stumbling and halting and afraid!
 The time is past for Right Divine,
 The people have ceased to bend the knee,
 The end is coming for me and mine—
 I hear the roaring of the sea."

"Down there came like a river in flood
 A crowd of men, haggard and worn;
 Frantic and furious and forlorn.
 "What do you want? I asked of one;
 He answered: 'The earth for his children dear—
 For as free as the light of the sun—
 And fair portion of life's good cheer,
 Of corn and wine, and sheep and beaves;
 All that the earth produces free.
 Why should we starve amid the bursting
 sheaves?
 We've heard the roaring of the sea."

"The billowy, rising, roaring sea—
 The stifling, swathing, blinding mist—
 A Claus by night, a To be, To be,
 And a ruddy sunrise not to rise.
 Hear it, ye preachers of the creed!
 Take heed, ye wise without a need!
 There's something better than plant needs,
 There's a future for the future seed.
 "Each for himself is a gospel of lies,
 That never was issued by God's decree—
 There's fresh fire light on the morning skies,
 There's a health in the roaring of the sea."

MRS. MULLER'S HOUSES.

The rooms we live in we rent from an old Swiss woman, who has occupied the premises for twenty-six years. She rents the ground from one of the old land owning families of this city—a family that can trace its genealogy for well nigh a century, and like many of the noblest houses of Europe, was founded by a butcher. The present representative of the family belongs to it by brevet only, having entered it by adoption. He does not carry on the butcher business, though I believe there are several butchers working for him, as well as store keepers, milliners and dress makers, physicians, lawyers, laborers, and the Swiss woman from whom we rent our rooms. Indirectly, I do a little work for him myself.

The house my old Swiss woman owns—let us call her Mrs. Muller, though that isn't her real name—Mrs. Muller's house, then, was built by her husband twenty-six years ago. Mrs. Muller was young then, and I hear she was beautiful—though now at fifty she is gray, haggard and wrinkled—and she came over from Switzerland to marry her betrothed, who had come to this country a few years before to seek his fortune and was doing well.

Young Muller built the house I live in as a residence for his bride. Land in this neighborhood was in very slight demand in those days, and there were plenty of vacant lots. Most of it belonged to the butcher-founded family, who, as they had already left off work, had no use for it themselves and found it difficult to get other people to pay for the privilege of using it. So when Muller went to them seeking a place on which to build his house they were very glad to see him. They didn't care to sell him any land—probably they had an affection for the old family acres—but they would do what practically came to the same thing—they would rent him what he needed on a long lease. And when cautious Muller asked what would happen when the long lease came to an end—oh! that would be all right and there shouldn't be any difficulty about a renewal. So Muller rented six city lots and in the middle of them built a nice little two story brick house with a four-roomed extension.

Muller prospered fairly well in his business, and would, perhaps, have ended by realizing a fortune. But unluckily, before he had married many years, affairs called him to Havana, where the yellow fever laid its clutch on him. And so he died, leaving his widow a few thousand dollars in bank, a comfortable house and the unexpired lease of his six lots.

The widow didn't sit down to waste her life in useless grief. She was an active, energetic woman, though simple minded and unused to business, and she possessed an accomplishment which at that time was rare indeed in New York—she was a splendid cook. So having plenty of room to spare, she took in boarders and cooked for them herself, and flourished exceedingly, and the little fortune in the bank began to grow.

Then her landlord, the descendant of the butcher, gave her some advice. He was very affable and chatty was her landlord, and liked to see his tenants doing well. So he pointed out to her that her boarding house business might be made a very profitable one if she would only extend it. She had plenty of land she wasn't using; why not build another house? Only leased land, did she say? Oh! please! he would never make her any trouble. So the widow drew her little store from the bank and put up another small house and furnished it on credit. Then she took in more boarders, made more money and blessed her kind and thoughtful landlord.

But one day Mrs. Muller met with an accident that compelled her to take to her bed, and ended by leaving her an almost helpless invalid. She could no longer look after her houses herself—worst of all, she could no longer cook. The boarders complained, and threatened, and gradually left her. The pension Muller, as she used to call it, became a dismal failure. The bank account, which had begun to grow a little, vanished entirely, and poor Mrs. Muller began to despair.

But her kindly landlord comforted her. He reminded her how much better off she was than many other women. Sure, she was an invalid, but had she not two nice little houses, and a lease with several years to run? Why shouldn't she let furnished rooms, since she couldn't take boarders any longer. All she would need would be a servant to look after the

rooms. Of course she couldn't make as much money as she had done by her boarders, but still she might be very comfortable.

Well, she was thankful for the advice and followed it. But the furnished room letting wasn't a success. She couldn't see to things herself, but must trust everything to a servant. And the servant, as servants will do in such cases, soon became the mistress without any of the mistress's cares and responsibilities. The lodgers complained of rudeness and inattention; the servant denied the charges, and the lodgers settled the dispute by going elsewhere. The furnished room project had to be given up. The widow was rather glad of it than otherwise, for she had come to be afraid of the servant herself. She sold her furniture and let her rooms unfurnished and without attendance, taking up her own abode on a single floor in one of her houses.

Meantime the years were passing and the lease was running out. Property in the neighborhood had taken an upward start and was becoming more valuable day by day. People were building all around her. Once a real estate agent called upon her and talked as though he had a purchaser for her houses, but when he learned how short a time her lease had to run he went away and came no more. Her landlord cheered her up by telling her that he would never give her any trouble. But when, in her innocence, she asked for another twenty-one years' lease he only laughed and said he could hardly go so far as that. But he found a florist for her, who rented part of her ground and thus added to her scanty income.

When the lease had only about two more years to run, the landlord died, and his adopted son reigned in his stead. This young man was astonished when he learned how small a rent the widow had to pay. "What a lucky woman you are," he said to her one day. "Why, my other property round here brings in five, six and ten times what you pay; and on building leases, too, so that my tenants have to build first-class houses, and thus improve the neighborhood. You ought to be rich, with the splendid chance you've had." The widow tried to tell him, in her broken French English, that during most of her lease the land had been of very little value; but the young landlord didn't seem to understand her. He was not a bad fellow, this young owner of the earth. He really pitied the widow, and wouldn't have injured her for the world. But it seemed to him part of the eternal fitness of things that people in her station should have to content themselves with a good deal less than people in his.

Time passed until the lease had only about four months to run, and one day the widow went down to the landlord's office to see what he was going to do about the future. At first he did not seem inclined to make any concessions, telling her that he ought to get for the land as much as the surrounding land was leased for, and that if she couldn't pay it others could be found who would. She pleaded with him. All she owned in the world stood on those lots; her health was gone, and if she had to leave her home she must go to the poor house. His predecessor had promised her a home on that land as long as she lived. The promise of the dead landlord had its influence on the young man, and he finally told her he would not exact what the land was worth, but would be kind to her, and on the expiration of the lease would let her have it for the succeeding year for double the present rent. She must be satisfied with this, he said, and might consider herself a very lucky woman. She begged for a long lease, but the young landlord explained that in justice to himself he could only let her have the land from year to year. He showed her, too, that instead of raising her rent he had actually lowered it, since he not only gave her the use of the land, but of the houses on it, which now of course belonged to him. Mrs. Muller hadn't thought of this before, and the sudden realization that she must hereafter pay somebody else for the privilege of using the houses her husband and herself had built, was like a blow to her.

Of course she accepted the landlord's terms. There was nothing else for her to do. The doubling of the rent compelled her to get along with smaller accommodations, and she had to still further reduce her living expenses. But all things are possible, and the widow managed to get along. Instead of occupying a floor she lived in two rooms in one of the houses and took more lodgers.

Next year the rent was raised again. The third year it was increased once more. The fourth year it was left unchanged, but the landlord cut off two lots from the property and thus diminished the income from the florist. The fifth year there was still another raise. By this time Mrs. Muller was living in a sort of closet, which she would have hesitated to ask a servant to sleep in, and had screwed her lodgers' rents up to the very highest possible pitch.

I have lived with Mrs. Muller now for five years. In all that time I know that the poor old lady has not had a new dress or bonnet. I have seen her contract her living expenses year by year, until really it seems that she has learned to live on next to nothing at all. Her tenants now pay her all the rent they can possibly afford. If they move out, it is doubtful if others will come in to take their places; for the houses are old and ramshackle, and the young landlord says it won't pay him to repair them. The first of May is near at hand, and the landlord hasn't yet declared his pleasure. He is not an unkind man. He gives largely to charities, and he has a real interest in Mrs. Muller, whom he speaks of patronizingly as an old family dependent—a legacy from his adoptive father. If he is pitiful, the old lady may squeeze along for a year or two yet. But "property has its duties," and I greatly fear his sense of justice to himself will compel him to stifle his compassion for the widow. In that case, there will be nothing before her but the poor house.

Mrs. Muller has been telling me her story for the hundredth time, in her broken English. She doesn't complain. She simply cannot understand. She has

struggled to the best of her ability—lived honestly and frugally, and put her trust in God. She has never wasted the modest competence her husband left her, yet somehow it has disappeared, and in her old age she finds herself naked and alone. I have tried to explain the matter to her, but she cannot make it out. But I can see that a fixed resolve is gradually forming in her mind. If *le bon Dieu*—she calls Him that—lets her be thrust into the street, it will be a sign that He has forsaken her. "Ze poo'ouse," she says—"ah! jamaist jamaist!" Well, there is an alternative, and I can see she is thinking of it.

WILLIAM MCCABE.

The Landless.

Augustine Duganne.

The landless! the landless!
 The wretches for a crust—
 Behold to outer darkness
 These wretched men are thrust.
 Hear their sullen mutterings;
 Their curses low and deep;
 And I see their bodies writhing
 Like a maniac in his sleep.
 Will no lightning rend their fetters
 Will no shock water their eyes?
 In the name of truth and manhood,
 Will they never—never rise!

The landless! the landless!
 They have no household gods;
 Their fathers' graves are trampled—
 For strangers own the sods.
 They have no home nor country—
 No roof nor household hearth—
 They roam about from house to house,
 The beautiful glad earth!
 They fight a stranger's battles,
 And they build a stranger's dome—
 But the landless!—the landless!
 God help them!—have no home!

"No! by the Profits of a Monopoly!"—Oh No!
 of Course Not!

One of the most remarkable dividend paying concerns in the world is the Elston land company of Birmingham, Ala. The record of dividends paid by stockholders during the last few years has been as follows:

1881.....	10 per cent.....	\$20,000
1882.....	25 per cent.....	50,000
1883.....	50 per cent.....	100,000
1884.....	75 per cent.....	150,000
1885.....	100 per cent.....	200,000
1886.....	125 per cent.....	250,000
1887.....	150 per cent.....	300,000
1888.....	175 per cent.....	350,000
Total to date.....		\$875,000

The average as shown by these figures for five years (not counting 1888, when only three months have passed), was over 500 per cent a year, and the total amount paid out as dividends since 1883 has been \$3,700,000. This money has been made, not by the profits of a monopoly, but by stock watering, from which the public suffer, but simply by the natural enhancement in the value of land brought about by the building up of a small village into a great city.

He'll Never Get the Congregation.
 The Baltimore American says that in 1884 Mr. Bland had the pulpit, and this year he has Depeve.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

BELFORD'S MAGAZINE.

Meurs, Belford, Clarke & Co. beg to announce that in May they will issue the first number of a new monthly magazine, to be devoted to politics, fiction, poetry, general literature, science and art.

In politics the new magazine will give an independent support to the democratic party and to the present administration. It will advocate the extinguishment of the surplus, not by squandering it in extravagant expenditures, which are usually merely a disguised form of widespread corruption, but by a reduction in taxation. It will advocate the consumption of the reduction by a reform of the present inequities and burdensome tariff in the direction of free trade or a tariff for revenue purposes only; such reform to be effected in the interests of the farmers, the workmen, and the great mass of the population, as opposed to the manipulators of rings and trusts, and other monopolists whom the present tariff enables to accumulate vast fortunes at the expense of the general community. These and other political and social questions of general interest will be treated in a popular manner, suitable to the pages of a magazine which is intended to reach all classes of the people.

The department of fiction will be exceptionally full. Instead of a serial story, dragging its slow length through several months, and exhausting the patience of the reader, a complete novel will be published in each number, and each issue will also contain one or more short stories complete.

In these departments of politics and fiction, and also in those of general literature, science, and art, the very best talent of the country will be enlisted. As the publishers are convinced that the distribution of magazines has been greatly overdone in this country, they have decided to dispense with illustrations altogether. They intend that their magazine shall be read, not that its pages shall be merely turned over for the purpose of looking at pictures.

As editor-in-chief, the publishers are glad to be able to announce that they have secured the services of Col. Don Pratt, a gentleman of long and varied literary experience, both as a journalist and as a literary critic, and also a patriot well known throughout the land by reason of his connection with the history and politics of the country during the past twenty-five years.

He will be assisted by a staff of sub-editors, and also by a large number of able contributors, among whom will be:

DAVID A. WELLS,
 DON FRANK HURD,
 PROF. W. G. SUMNER,
 J. S. MOORE (Parson Merchants),
 HON. JOHN G. CARLISLE,
 HENRY WATSON,
 HENRY GEORGE,
 JULIAN HAWTHORNE,
 EDGAR SALTS,
 JOHN JAMES PIATT,
 THOS. G. SHEARMAN,
 GEN. H. V. BOYNTON,
 SARAH B. M. PIATT,
 EDGAR FAWCETT,
 JOEL BENTON,
 ELLA WHEELER WILCOX,
 REV. GEORGE LORIMER,
 H. HERON-LLEN,
 COATES-KINNEY,
 JAMES WHITCOMB RILEY,
 SCOTLE SMITH ("Paddy"),
 GERTRUDE GARRISON.

BELFORD'S MONTHLY will be a first-class medium for advertising, as the publishers guarantee a bona fide circulation during the first six months of at least 70,000 copies per month.

Price, \$2.50 a year or 25 cents per number.
 N. B.—All business communications should be addressed to the publishers, 12 Union square, New York City. Contributions and editorial correspondence should be sent to the editor at the same address.

BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.,
 Publishers,
 New York, Chicago and San Francisco.

BOUND VOLUMES

OF
THE STANDARD.

A limited number of bound volumes of THE STANDARD, in heavy boards, are offered for sale at the following prices:

Volumes 1 and 2, bound in a single volume, \$5.00.
 (Postage 75 cents extra.)
 Volume 2, bound separately, \$3.50.
 (Postage 50 cents extra.)

Address THE STANDARD,
 12 Union square, east, New York.

HENRY GEORGE'S WORKS.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY,

An Inquiry Into the Cause of Industrial Depression and of Increase of Want With Increase of Wealth—The Remedy.
 BY HENRY GEORGE.
 28 pages.

CONTENTS:

INTRODUCTION.—THE PROBLEM.
 Book I.—WAGES AND CAPITAL.
 Chap. 1. The current doctrine of insufficiency.
 2. The meaning of the terms.
 3. Wages not drawn from capital, but produced by labor.
 4. The maintenance of laborers not drawn from capital.
 5. The true functions of capital.

Book II.—POPULATION AND SUBSISTENCE.
 Chap. 1. The Malthusian theory—its genesis and support.

2. Inferences from fact.
 3. The status of the problem thus explained.
 4. Disproof of the Malthusian theory.

Book III.—THE LAWS OF DISTRIBUTION.
 Chap. 1. The inquiry narrowed to the laws of distribution—necessary relation of these laws.

2. Rent and the law of rent.
 3. Interest and the cause of interest.
 4. Of surplus capital and of profits often mistaken for interest.

5. The law of interest.
 6. Wages and the law of wages.
 7. Of taxation and coordination of these laws.

8. The status of the problem thus explained.
 Book IV.—EFFECT OF MATERIAL PROGRESS UPON THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

Chap. 1. The dynamics of the problem yet to seek.
 2. Effect of increase of population upon the distribution of wealth.

3. Effect of improvements in the arts upon the distribution of wealth.
 4. Effect of the expectation raised by material progress.

Book V.—THE PROBLEM SOLVED.
 Chap. 1. The primary cause of recurring paroxysms of industrial depression.

2. The persistence of poverty amid advancing wealth.

Book VI.—THE REMEDY.
 Chap. 1. Insufficiency of remedies currently advocated.

2. The true remedy.
 Book VII.—JUSTICE OF THE REMEDY.

Chap. 1. Inflation of private property in land.
 2. Enslavement of laborers the ultimate result of private property in land.

3. Property in land historically considered.
 4. Property in land in the United States.

Book VIII.—APPLICATION OF THE REMEDY.
 Chap. 1. Private property in land inconsistent with the social organization and social life.

2. How equal rights to the land may be asserted and secured.
 3. The proposition tried by the canons of taxation.

4. Indorsements and objections.
 Book IX.—EFFECTS OF THE REMEDY.

Chap. 1. Of the effect upon the production of wealth.
 2. Of the effect upon distribution and thence upon production.

3. Of the effect upon individuals and classes.
 4. Of the changes that would be wrought in social organization and social life.

Book X.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS.
 Chap. 1. The current theory of human progress—its insufficiency.

2. Differences in civilization—to what due.
 3. The law of human progress.

4. How modern civilization may decline.
 5. The central truth.

Conclusion.—THE PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUAL LIFE.
 The new Land and Labor Library edition of "Progress and Poverty" is now ready, price thirty-five cents. This is printed on better paper, in larger type, is better bound and a considerably larger book than the previous twenty cent edition.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

32 pages.

CONTENTS:

1. The increasing importance of social questions.
 2. Political dangers.
 3. Contingent increase of social pressure.
 4. Two opposing tendencies.
 5. The march of concentration.
 6. The tendency to social conditions.
 7. It is the last of all possible worlds!
 8. That we all might be rich.
 9. First principles.
 10. The rights of man.
 11. Dumping garbage.
 12. Overproduction.
 13. Unemployed labor.
 14. The effects of machinery.
 15. Slavery and slavery.
 16. Public debt and indirect taxation.
 17. The functions of government.
 18. What we must do.
 19. The great reform.
 20. The American farmer.
 21. City and country.
 22. Conclusion.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

An Examination of the Tariff Question with Especial Regard to the Interests of Labor.
 BY HENRY GEORGE.

32 pages.

CONTENTS:

I. Introduction.
 II. Clearing ground.
 III. Of methods.
 IV. Protectionists a universal need.
 V. The protective tariff.
 VI. Trade.
 VII. Production and production.
 VIII. Tariffs for revenue.
 IX. Tariffs for protection.
 X. The encouragement of industry.
 XI. The home in stock and home trade.
 XII. Exports and imports.
 XIII. Confusion arising from the use of money.
 XIV. Is high wages necessitate protection?
 XV. Of advantages and disadvantages as reasons for protection.
 XVI. The development of manufactures.
 XVII. Protection and producers.
 XVIII. Effect of protection on American industry.
 XIX. Protection and wages.
 XX. The abolition of protection.
 XXI. Uniqueness of the free trade argument.
 XXII. The Road to Wealth of Free Trade.
 XXIII. The Real Strength of Protection.
 XXIV. The Paradox.
 XXV. The worker that Takes All that is Left.
 XXVI. True Free Trade.
 XXVII. The Lion in the Way.
 XXVIII. Free Trade and Socialism.
 XXIX. Political Politics.
 XXX. Conclusion.

THE LAND QUESTION.

What It Involves, and How Alone It Can Be Settled.
 BY HENRY GEORGE.

87 pages.

PROPERTY IN LAND.

A Passage-at-Arms Between the Duke of Argyll and Henry George.
 77 pages.

FORTSHRITT AND ARMUTH.

(Progress and Poverty in German.)
 TRANSLATION OF G. D. F. GUTSCHOW.
 60 pages.

PRICE LIST.

Progress and Poverty, paper..... \$.35
 " " cloth..... 1.00
 " " half calf or half morocco..... 2.50
 Social Problems, paper..... .20
 " " cloth..... 1.00
 " " half calf or half morocco..... 2.50
 Protection or Free Trade, paper..... .25
 " " cloth..... 1.00
 " " half calf or half morocco..... 3.00
 Property in Land, paper..... .30
 The Land Question, paper..... .10
 Progress and Poverty, German, paper..... .10
 For sale by all book-sellers, or sent postpaid on receipt of price. Foreign editions of these books imported on order.
 HENRY GEORGE, 12 Union square, New York.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.'S

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Novel with a Plot:

THE TRUTH ABOUT TRISTREM VARICK.

By Edgar Saltus, author of "Mr. Inoué's Misadventure," etc.
 12mo. Cloth, \$1. Paper Covers, 50 cents.
 In this novel Mr. Saltus has treated a subject hitherto unexploited in fiction. The scene is Fifth Avenue, the action emotional, the plot a surprise. "There is," some one has said, "as much mud in the upper classes as in the lower; only in the former it is gilded." This aphorism might serve as epigraph to "Tristrem Varick."

Thirteenth thousand ready April 1.

THE TARIFF ON IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES AND THE FREE LIST.

As contained in act of March 3, 1883, also the Hawaiian Reciprocity Treaty, and extracts from the Navigation and Commerce Acts, and from the Tariff Act of 1883.
 Indexed. 12mo. Paper Covers, 25 cents.

ASHES OF THE FUTURE.

By Edward Heron-Allen.
 Beautifully printed in the best French style, with an illustrated cover, 50 cents.

"The story is of absorbing interest."—Chicago Journal.
 "The work is a very vigorous and cultivated vein, as well as of a deep thinking and fervid brain. It is the story of a restless lover of many things, and of too many good women whose hearts are broken and whose lives are shattered."—Brooklyn Eagle.

"MES AMOURS."

Confessions: Passionate and Playful.
 Written to me by people, married and unmarried, and my answers to some of them. With an introduction and notes. Illustrated, small 4to, with portrait, \$1.50. Solina Dolara, author of the play, "In the Palace."

"It is seldom that the English reader happens upon a book so full of French humor as this pretty volume. 'Mes Amours,' the opening selection, is edited with a running fire of comments that render it delightful. The afterthoughts' added to all the verses are often very clever and womanish."—New York Herald.

PRINCE COASTWIND'S VICTORY;

OR,

The Fairy Bride of Croton Lake.

By Mrs. Miles B. McNamara.
 With illustrations. Small 4to, cloth, illustrated cover, \$1.00.

"A pretty fairy story, which will delight while it taxes the credulity of young readers. The book is tastefully printed and in handsome covers, and is included in a box ready for mailing."—Chicago Inter Ocean.

THE ROMANCE OF A QUIET WATERING PLACE.

12mo. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
 Thirty French illustrations by Graves.
 By a New York Society Lady.

A SLAVE OF CIRCUMSTANCES.

By E. Delancey Person.
 12mo. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
 A Novel of Incident, Plot and Action. Scene, Fifth Avenue, New York.

IN PRESS:

A DREAM AND A FORGETTING.

By Julian Hawthorne.
 12mo. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
 Mr. Hawthorne's latest and most interesting novel.

HIS WAY AND HER WILL.

Author unknown.
 12mo. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
 A great New York Society Novel.

SOPHIA-ADELAIDE.

Illustrated with Portraits of the Princess.
 Paper covers, 50 cents.
 "The Deserted Daughter of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert." An awful story of romantic life by a Princess.

CHESTNUTS NEW AND OLD.

By Edw. Nye.
 12mo. cloth, \$1.00. Paper cover, 50 cents.
 His Last and Funniest Book.

THE POLITICS OF LABOR.

By Phillips Thompson.
 Cloth, gilt top, \$1.25.

"Tax the Land!"

What wrongs are we thus to fret and to
fume,
While landlords are dangling their bonnet
and plume;
While they ride in hot haste, wooing seats far
and near;
That the rights of the people—be kept in the
rear.
Their law making power is the dreary old
past,
Let us demonstrate any, no longer shall last—
Let us struggle and fight for the dawn of the
day.
When the rights of the people shall para-
mount sway.

The rights of the people, the rights of our
towns,
The rights of our crofters, which every one
owns;
The rights of our kinsmen, in county or shire,
Are rights which the heart of each freeman
inspire.

But townsmen and crofters, and kinsmen
alike,
Must aid to restore what our country will
yield;
Must rely on the force, the strong muscle of
fact,
That industry's freed, when the land is full
taxed.

The land, when it's taxed, will our labor re-
lieve;
The land, when it's taxed, will our commerce
retrieve;
The land, when it's taxed, will prompt lead
to its use;
The land, when it's taxed, will prevent its
abuse.

Come, then, let us wreck the vile rule of the
few,
Dismiss the old parliament, vote in the new;
Let the voice of the people, exultant with
glee,
Proclaim that our country, our loved land, is
free.

That it's freed from the grasp of the laird
and the squire,
That the laborer has now the full worth of
his hire;
That our lochs and our rivers, our mountains
adored,
To our country and kin are forever restored;

Restored and retained in the interests of
ALL;
Restored even to those whom our league did
oppress;
Let the world take note that Auld Scotland
is free,
From the swell of the Solway to Skye on the
sea.

PHILADELPHIA'S HOMES.

What is Philadelphia's secret? Alone
among the great cities of the earth she
claims to have solved the problem of
housing her population without packing
them into tenements. Her boast is that
within her borders every family has a
separate home, and a large proportion of
families own their homes. Is her claim a
well founded one, and if so, to what
happy accidents of location, law, custom
or popular sentiment does she owe her
exceptional good fortune?

First let it be remarked that Philadel-
phia's claim of superiority to other Ameri-
can cities is not altogether ingenious. She
has, it is true, no tenement houses,
but she has a very considerable tenement
house population. Within her borders
are scores of miles of alleys and courts
where dwell the poverty stricken. New
York has nothing more dreary, mean or
wretched looking than the Philadelphia
alley. The blackened and weather worn
house fronts, the offensive surface drain-
age, the yard wide sidewalks and narrow
roadway, afford a spectacle more painfully
disagreeable than that of the New York
tenement house block. It may be ques-
tioned if life in the alley is on the whole
more wholesome or more pleasant than
life in the tenement. It may be doubted
if Philadelphia's poor know anything
more of the comforts of a home than do
the poor of New York city.

Philadelphia has not escaped the curse
of that poverty that everywhere attends
on the aggregation of wealth. The festering
ulcer of want afflicts her body politic
well nigh as grievously as it does that of
any other large city. But she has to
some extent relaxed the barriers that shut
her people from the soil. She is far from
permitting them the full use of the earth;
but she does allow them greater privileges
of mere sleeping and being upon it. She
has, in round numbers, one dwelling
house to five of population, against 1 to
16 in New York, 1 to 8 in Chicago, 1 to 8
in Boston, and 1 to 6 in Baltimore. This
is certainly something; and it is worth
while learning how it has been done.

In the current number of the Harvard
Quarterly Journal of Economics, Messrs.
Edward P. Allinson and Boies Penrose dis-
cuss the causes of what they term this
"fixed municipal trait"; and though they
decline to claim any absolute accuracy of
demonstration, they show with sufficient
clearness what it is that has enabled Phila-
delphia to earn for herself the title of "a
city of homes."

The first cause is to be found in the very
foundation of the city, the magnificent
ambition of whose plan may be said to
have fostered the simultaneous growth of
a number of different centers which after-
ward combined to make the present city:

When Penn landed on the shores of the
Delaware, in 1681, one of his most cherished
ideas was the foundation of a great town,
and his beloved city was laid out on what must
have seemed, in those days of the wilderness,
a scale of magnificent distances. It stretched
about two miles, from the Delaware to the
Schuylkill, with a mile front on each. His
comprehensive scheme included a grant of a
city lot to each of the first adventurers; but,
as this was soon seen to be impossible, an ap-
portionment was made of lots in the adjacent
lands, which became known as the liberties.
The city grew to be the American metropolis.
In Germantown and the adjoining liberties
and districts, settlements grew into towns
modeled after the mother city, until at the
time of the consolidation, in 1854, there were
twenty-nine separate districts, boroughs and
townships, each of considerable size, and all
closely connected with the city proper. The
first settlers and their descendants were
mainly farmers and well to do, and Philadel-
phia soon became, first the main commercial
and then the principal manufacturing city of
the land. Manufacturers were scattered
through the incorporated districts and bor-

oughs and cities, forming nuclei for large
bodies of mechanics, laborers, shop keepers,
and their concomitant trades and profes-
sions. This development around so many
centers, allowing, as it did, ample room for
the expansion of the respective settlement
within easy reach of business centers, un-
doubtedly accounts for the possibility of the
separate house system. The necessity for
crowding, which the same population would
have involved if clustered round one center,
was absent.

A second and equally important factor
has been the institution of ground rents,
which, once common in all the colonies,
has survived and flourished in Philadel-
phia under the influence of favoring
circumstances. Messrs. Allinson and Pen-
rose recite at some length the origin and
legal status of this form of land tenure.
For our purpose it will be sufficient to
point out the distinguishing features of
the ground rent system.

Ground renting is simply the engage-
ment by a person who is about to use a
piece of land to pay another person a cer-
tain fixed annual tax for the privilege.
Where in New York a man anxious to build
a house would find himself compelled to
first pay a very considerable lump sum to
the lord of the soil, in Philadelphia he
would be obliged simply to covenant to
pay a certain yearly tax or blackmail. It
is evident that the tax is much more en-
durable under the second system than
under the first. The man of moderate
means, who in New York would find his
purse emptied before even the foundations
of his house were laid, in Philadelphia
enabled to expend his entire capital upon
his building, and thereafter has only a
fixed yearly tax to pay, which he can, at
the end of a period of years, commute for
a lump sum if he desires.

But the most important effect of the
Philadelphia ground rent system is the
check it exercises upon land speculation.
It tends to make the holding of vacant lots
unprofitable. For so long as the landlords
do not unanimously combine, the effect of
a few landlords refusing to allow their lots
to be used would be not so much to en-
hance the value of the lots as to induce
intending land users to go elsewhere where
they could obtain equal advantages. To
this effect, of course, the vast area of Phila-
delphia and the number of industrial
nuclei within its borders largely contrib-
ute.

As from the New York system of land
monopoly have developed the builders'
loan and short term mortgage, so from
the Philadelphia system of land monopoly
has sprung the building association.

A workman who has no capital and is de-
pendent upon his wages may perhaps be able
to set aside a surplus of \$5 or \$10 a month.
With this he buys, say, five shares of stock in
a building association, which entitles him to
a loan of \$1,000. A lot is purchased on
ground rent, say \$500, and a loan is pur-
chased from the association for \$500, at from
five to fifteen per cent. premium, as money
may all at the time. The house is erected.
The association is secured by the mortgage
of the fee with the stock as collateral. The
householder pays his rental, \$50 per annum;
\$5 a month on his building association stock,
\$50; the interest on his loan, say \$50; for
taxes, \$12; his water rent, \$5, making a total
of \$170 or \$180 for ten years, at the end of
which time the series is wound up and he has
paid \$1,800 to \$2,000 under a compulsory sav-
ing fund and owns his own house, subject to
a ground rent. If he had rented he would
have paid out \$1,400 to \$1,600 for rent alone,
and would not have owned the house. Of
course, could the purchaser have bought
enough, he would have been better off; or
could he have obtained credit to borrow at
six per cent on mortgage, and then bought
the stock as a non-borrowing member, he
would have been better off. But the utility
of the building association is for the indus-
trious workman without credit, who could
not get such a loan, and on whom the obli-
gation to the association acts as an incentive
to save money, to keep up his dues.

The field for building associations was found
in the scarcity of money and the necessity for
paying a high rate for money borrowed; and
the willingness of building associations to
loan is based on their policy, which permitted
them to loan on a junior security—subject to
the ground rent—up to the actual value of
the building, by reason of their holding the
collateral security of the stock of the bor-
rower, by virtue of which he makes monthly
payments on account of his debt, and thus is
constantly reducing the same. On a like
security the would be purchaser could not go
to any of the banking institutions or investors
and obtain a like loan, wherever to erect his
house. The building associations always pre-
ferred a ground rent as the senior charge
subject to which they should loan, for the
obvious reason that the principal thereof
could not be called for, so that the association
could not be obliged to protect itself beyond
the amount of a year, in the event of a
default by the owner of the fee.

But as all roads lead to Rome, so do all
economies of production tend ultimately
to the enrichment of those who control
the passive factor of production. The
ground rent system and building associa-
tions of Philadelphia have in the long run
benefited the land monopolists, and not
the land users. It is true, as the writers
in the *Journal of Economics* state, that
they have furnished "an opportunity for
the industrious workman to obtain a
home at the outset of his career;" but it
is also true that they have done this at the
expense, not of land monopolists as a class,
but of wealth producers as a class. The
land monopolist has secured the benefit
by an indirect and roundabout way, but
he has secured it with greater certainty
than by the ordinary method. By appar-
ently encouraging industry, he has in-
creased the amount of wealth subject to
his tax, and that without, on the whole,
reducing the rate of his taxation.

By the very act of entering a building
association, the Philadelphia workman
becomes fettered to the soil. He has as-
sumed a burden that he cannot lay aside
for years. He must keep up his payments
or risk the loss of all. His anxiety to do
this forces him to work for wages that he
would reject were he a free man. And
when he has paid for his house he has in
turn to meet the competition of those who
stand where he stood before; and the effect
of this competition is all the greater be-
cause he can afford to work for lower
wages than the man paying rent. The
general scale of wages is, at least, as low
in Philadelphia as in any other city of the
Union, and the unemployed are in full pro-
portion. Figures need not be hunted up.
The facts are known to all the trades
throughout the country. This low scale

of wages encourages the undertaking of
industrial enterprises, and these in turn,
through the pressure of their demand for
the use of land, surrender the extra profits
of their cheap labor to the all absorbing
owners of the one great monopoly.

So true is it that in economics as in
physics, every force must inevitably exert
its full effect. Repressed in one place, the
power of the landlord is but exerted more
effectually in another. The "city of
homes" is no nearer solving the great pov-
erty problem than the city of tenement
houses.

From a Scottish Business Man.

GLASGOW.—Hereby you have a subscrip-
tion list for THE STANDARD, and from Dum-
fries and elsewhere you will receive similar
lists. Every place to which I have sent your
paper (and I always use my ready copy by
sending it somewhere) I have requests for in-
formation as to where it can be got regularly.
If I could only get away from my business for
a while I believe I could soon make it nec-
essary for an edition of THE STANDARD to be
printed in this city here, even in 1884, upon the
"land for the people" platform, we were
pariahs to the official liberalism of the day.
Now we are their oracles whom they con-
sult when they want to go to the people for
their suffrages. Just at present we have an
impending parliamentary vacancy in Mid
Lothian, which includes nearly all mining
centers. It has been wooed by many suitors.
Captains in the army, retired merchants, and
so on, and the man just selected by the liberal
organizations (who condemned you and me
four years ago) is the man who goes furthest
on our lines. Our questions to candidates are
no longer treated with indifference. "Tax the
land." "Yes, four shillings in the pound or
more." "Abolish dear forests?" "Yes, and
the deer with them, likewise Wians." "Min-
ing royalties?" "These are the property of
the people." "Payment of members?" "Cer-
tainly, the people's servants should be paid
by the people." In very truth, the stone
which the builders refused has become the
headstone of the corner. More power to you.
WILLIAM SIMPSON.

Signing the Single Tax Memorial in Texas.

HOUSTON, TEX.—I saw some of our friends
in Galveston last week. They report that
six men out of seven sign the petition with
pleasure, and they, too, are very confident of
getting the signatures of a majority of the
voters in that county. Mr. Thomas Flann,
who, with Mr. Herman Kuhn, was for years
almost the only German man in the city, says
that the great majority of people whom he
meets with are now in favor of tax reform as
expressed in that memorial, and that he him-
self is no longer regarded as an incorrigible
crank by all his friends and acquaintances.
H. F. RING.

A May Day Song.

New York World.
'Tis the voice of the tenant,
I hear him complain:
The landlord is raising
My rental again.

How Federal Taxes Have Been Reduced.

From Congressional Bills Speech.
After Congress has largely increased the
duties on imports, and thus bestowed
most liberal and generous bounties on our
manufacturers, a light internal revenue tax
was imposed on the products of domestic
manufacture to help the government meet
the heavy demands of war. The internal tax
imposed on home manufactures was but a
trifle of the heavy burden imposed on the peo-
ple by the increased duties on foreign goods.
It brought to the treasury in 1866 \$127,000,
—a sum which was less than five per cent
upon the value of the manufactured product
of that year. It was thought not to be un-
reasonable to require this small contribution
from those whose bounty congress had in-
creased from eighteen to forty per cent in
the price of the product. But that tax is
gone. As soon as the war was ended com-
plaint was made that this was a war
tax, that it was no longer necessary, and
it was repealed. . . . Was the tax of
three per cent on the value of the product
by the manufacturer more oppressive than
the tax of seventy-nine per cent on both
foreign and domestic blankets paid by the
people? Was the tax of three per cent on a
wool hat paid by the manufacturer more op-
pressive than the tax of seventy-nine per
cent on both the hat and the domestic goods
of the same kind paid by the consumer? Was
a tax of three per cent on railroad companies,
banking companies, insurance companies, ex-
press and telegraph companies more oppres-
sive than the tax of seventy-nine per cent
on the same kind of goods? Was a three per cent
tax on woolen shawls? Was a three per cent
tax on a woolen shirt? The party then
in power certainly thought so, for the taxes
on wealth are gone, and the war tax on
clothing, the tax on food, the tax on the im-
plements of labor still remain with us,
and the war against our prosperity, our la-
bor and our commerce is still being vigorously
prosecuted.

Truth and Humbug Mixed.

The Cunard steamer Cephalonia, which ar-
rived in this port yesterday, brought a hu-
man freight of 1,679 souls! All but seventy-
four of these were American emigrants, most
of them seeking labor and liberty in this land
of the free.

Think of it! A single steamer bringing to
Boston more than a thousand recruits for the
great army of labor!

Well, thank fortune, there is room enough
in this boundless land of fertility for all the
good, honest, industrious men and women
that may come. For each of them adds more
to the total production of the country than he
or she consumes.

But with ship loads of European labor com-
ing in upon us, what effect can any tariff have
in "protecting" American labor against Euro-
pean labor?

Why the "Tribune" Expects to Carry Ken- tucky.

Kentucky has over twenty pauper count-
ies, an empty treasury, a common school sys-
tem that would be a disgrace to any northern or
western state, on account of a want of funds
to carry it on properly. The democratic
majority has been falling off steadily for sev-
eral years. The republicans have gained
three members of congress and four of six
districts are doubtful; the workmen are
justly indignant at the disgraceful ending of
the Thobee-Cardie contested election case,
and the people generally are crying for a
change. Taking all this into consideration,
would anybody be surprised to see Kentucky
break away from the solid south and give a
republican majority this fall?

Ask Any Man Who Visits Europe How Much Clothing He Takes There, and How Much He Saves There, Though the Custom House When He Comes Back.

New York Press.

"GO WEST, YOUNG MAN!"

What the Young Man Who Follows Horace
Greely's Advice Must Now Expect.

The Union Pacific Employees' Magazine, in
its last issue, says:

There is a movement on foot among real
estate owners of Colorado to get up a grand
immigration boom. It is the intention to
flood eastern and European cities with cir-
culars advertising Colorado. Every intelli-
gent man will be given to encourage people to
pack up and come west. While the principle
object of this is to get persons to settle on
land, it is also to bring thousands of laboring
men west to seek employment. Grand state-
ments will be made regarding the demand for
labor and the high rate of wages paid. This
will cause many who do not stop to in-
vestigate to move with their families. This
causes a demand for houses, for you cannot
live out of doors here any more than in the
east. This will cause the real estate holders a
chance to reap a harvest out of the high
rents they can demand and get, for they will
be forced up to enormous rates. They're high
now.

We wish to inform our eastern friends that
there are thousands of men in Colorado and
other western states now out of work; that
most of the land is held by speculators who
are desirous of realizing. This boom is being
aided by large employers of labor to force
the cost of living still lower.

The only thought in rushing immigration is
gain to those who are booming it. They
never have a thought of the suffering and
misery they too often cause. The unpaid
laborers who are sent west are better off
than the reaction comes, and it always does come,
they reap another harvest from the disaster
they have caused. Let no flaming advertise-
ment throw you off your guard, plenty of
those who have been seen on the coast, in
every day, disappointed in not finding re-
munerative employment, having spent all the
money they had, they offer their services for
a crust of bread to eat.

Remember that wages are not high in the
west; that places do not beguiling, that
there are thousands of men seeking work,
and that what they receive is below that paid
in the east, when the cost of living is taken
into consideration. A word to the wise is
sufficient.

Four young men of Taunton ask the Boston
Globe if Colorado or California would be good
places for young men willing to work for a
living to go to. To which the Globe replies:

In either California or Colorado there are
good opportunities for energetic and care-
ful young men who have learned useful
trades, or who are possessed of capital; but
we are of the opinion that even these chances
are not so numerous in proportion to the
population, nor more promising in any way,
than similar opportunities in the east.

As for young men who have only their
labor to sell, without capital, we believe
that neither Massachusetts nor California is
better than either Colorado or California. The
chief money making business in the far
western states is the business, if such it can
be called, of owning land. In every com-
munity it is the land owners who are the rich
and the most cases it is the ownership of
land that has made them wealthy. Some
years ago land could be acquired without
much outlay, but there is very little desirable
land to be had now except by paying a good
round price for it. Thus the business of
getting rich out of a rise of land values is
closed except to those who possess capital.

Government land may still be taken up in
theory, by actual settlers, without charge;
but it is very difficult to find land worth
using land and thereby enabling to pri-
vate ownership. And when agricultural land
has been secured it is doubtful if the ad-
vantages to the actual farmer are great, enough
to compensate him for the expense of getting
it, and his far removal from markets.

THE SINGLE TAX MOVEMENT.

Reasons For It Given by Its Texas Ad- vocates.

The memorial to the Texas legislature urg-
ing the submission of a constitutional amend-
ment exempting personal property and im-
provements from taxation and declaring that
taxes shall be levied on land values only,
gives the following reasons for the amend-
ment:

First.—That its adoption, while increasing
the tax on vacant lands held for speculative
purposes, would result in reducing taxes on
landed homesteads from twenty-five to
seventy-five per cent, without in any way in-
creasing the burden of indirect taxation.

Second.—It is claimed that farmers, mer-
chants, mechanics and manufacturers ought
not to be compelled to pay for the privilege
of using land and thereby enhancing the
prosperity of a community, from two to five
times as much in taxes as land speculators
and monopolists are required to pay for the
privilege of withholding land of equal value
from use, and thereby retarding the progress
of a community. It is urged in this con-
nection that the farmer, merchant, mechanic
or manufacturer, by placing a house or a fac-
tory on land or by otherwise improving it,
adds greatly to the value of the vacant land
adjoining, held for speculative purposes; but
who gets the benefit of this increased in-
crement, the worker or the idler? Does the
owner of the land hurt any one by improving
it and giving employment to labor upon it?
If any one should be fined for not having
his taxes increased? If any one is to be fined
by an increase of taxation, why should it not
be the dog in the manger, who will neither
use his land nor let others use it?

Third.—It is claimed that he who is willing
to create a demand for labor by opening up
a farm, a coal bed, a mineral deposit, or by
putting a residence or factory on land, ought
not to be fined for his enterprise by the lev-
ying of a tax exceeding in amount that paid
by the speculator and monopolist, who is hold-
ing adjoining vacant lands and lots, and
unused mineral deposits of equal value in
idleness for the purpose of drawing to him-
self an unearned increment produced by the
community energy and enterprise of the entire
community.

Fourth.—It is claimed that the value which
land has, exclusive of improvements on it,
results from the presence of population, that
it increases with the increase of population,
and that the value of the community energy
and enterprise of all, and that hence a tax
on these values simply enables the community
to appropriate for the good of all a portion
of the values which have been produced by
the community.

Fifth.—It is claimed that the adoption of
this amendment would render investments in
the bounties of nature for the purpose of fore-
stalling capital and labor LESS inviting and
LESS profitable, which the exemption from
taxation of buildings, tools, machinery and
all product of industry, would make invest-
ments in productive enterprises giving em-
ployment to capital and labor, MORE inviting
and MORE profitable, which business would
be the stimulus of greater demand for labor in-
duced, and the general prosperity and happi-
ness of all the people vastly enhanced.

To Lessen the Dangers of the Sea.

A German sailor has invented an oil rocket,
to be used at sea. The invention consists of
the rocket proper and an oil cylinder with an
exploding chamber. The cylinder is of thin
sheet metal, bottom and top, and the ex-
ploding chamber is also made of tin and has
a hollow tube, reaching into the center of the
oil cylinder, filled with powder. The rocket
may be exploded under water and the oil
will rise to the surface.

Experiments have been made made
proving the practical value of the invention.
In November last, on a voyage of the Werra
from this port to Bremen, a rocket with an
oil cylinder four inches high, was fired at an
angle of thirty degrees. It went 1,000 feet in
front of the vessel and the cylinder exploded
at a height of twenty feet above the water.
The oil was distributed over an area of about
two thousand square feet. Another rocket,
a five-inch cylinder, was fired at an elevation
of fifteen degrees in order to make it explode

under water. The oil rose promptly to the
surface and was distributed over a wide
area. The rolling of the sea quieted down.

WOMEN.

Women control theaters in Albany, Worces-
ter and Richmond.

Students of both sexes are admitted to
McGill college, Toronto, but they are in-
structed in separate classes. This does not
suit the young women, who have just signed
a petition asking for absolute co-education.

There are said to be fully two hundred
women employed in editorial capacities on the
various newspapers and journals published
in New York. Twenty-five years ago there
were not one-tenth of this number
similarly employed.

The duchesses of Montrose, Manchester,
and Newcastle are known in English sporting
circles as the "strawberry daisies." Their
graces have successfully courted notoriety,
the first by her ownership of race horses, the
second by her flirtations with the prince of
Wales, and the third by her elopement and
subsequent marriage with a tenor singer.

The Japanese read more American than
English books. Last year \$3,000 English and
119,000 American books were imported. Until
recently the editors of women's papers in
Japan were all men, but last month a tem-
perance paper was established at Tokio by
Miss Asai and Mrs. Sasaki, the secretary of
the Tokio woman's Christian temperance as-
sociation.

Rosa Bonheur, the animal painter, while at
work in her studio, wears male attire. Years
ago when visiting stables, cattle yards
and menageries, she dressed as a boy to
avoid attention by the men hanging about.
In the streets of Paris, however, she is a
large, elderly lady, rather plainly dressed in
black, her gray hair tucked under a close
bonnet, and unless for the peculiar strength
of her face and her piercing, attentive eyes,
it would not be noticed that she differed from
any other woman in the crowd, except that
she wears the red ribbon of the legion of
honor.

A most valuable series of papers is about
to appear in *Woman*, entitled "Prisoners of
Poverty Abroad," by Helen Campbell, who
is now in Europe investigating the subject
on behalf of that magazine. The series will
comprise twelve letters relating to the con-
dition of the poor in London, Paris, Berlin,
Vienna, Rome and other leading continental
cities, in all of which the writer visits per-
sonally the workshops and homes and talks
with women in all branches of labor in order
to obtain trustworthy information at first
hand and accurate knowledge of the life she
describes.

Figure This Out.

From Congressman Mill's Speech.

Suppose a laborer who is earning a dollar a
day by his work finds a suit of woolen clothes
that he can buy for \$10 without the tariff tax,
then the suit of clothes can be procured for
ten days' work; but the manufacturer comes
to congress and says, "I must be protected
against the man buying this cheap suit of
clothes," and congress protects him by put-
ting a duty of 100 per cent, or \$10 more. Now
if we require the laborer to work twenty
days to get his suit of clothes. Now tell me
if ten days of his labor have not been annihi-
lated? Has he not been required to work
twice as long under the tariff as he would
have done without to obtain his suit of
clothes?

Fearfully and Wonderfully Made.

Springfield Republican.

A boy in a city near Boston, in an oral ex-
amination was asked to tell what he could
about the human body, and this is what he
said:

"The human body is composed of three
parts—the head, which contains the brain;
the trunk, which contains the heart, lungs
and stomach, and the abdomen, which con-
tains the bowels, and these are a, e, i, o, u,
and sometimes w and y."

Standing Up to Be Counted.

Birmingham, Ala., Age.

It is very easy for a man to be brave when
it comes to nominating himself for office.

"THE MAN" APPEARS PROCLAIMS

THE MAN—The Shakespeare.

Spoken three hundred years ago, is no less a fact
today!

GEORGE WILSON,

MERCHANT TAILOR,

Formerly with Henry Poole, London,

Importer of Leading Novelties,

ENGLISH AND FRENCH CASSIMERES,

205 East Fourteenth street, New York.

P. S.—Send postal card and you will be waited on
with samples at office or residence.

MISS AGATHA MUNIER IS NOW

forming classes for instruction in vocal sing-
ing in all its branches, and in elocution. For
terms, etc., address MISS MUNIER, 223 East Thir-
teenth street, New York.

KANSAS STATE LECTURER.—THE

undersigned state lecturer and member of the
state central committee is now ready to respond
to calls for work and where the State of Kansas.
Address Rev. W. M. GOODEN, box 33, Larned, Kan.

NOTICE.

Those who believe that the public revenues
should be raised by a single and direct tax upon rel-
ative land values, and who favor the holding of a Na-
tional Convention, are requested to send names im-
mediately to

SAMUEL WILLIAMS,
Vin. cent, Ind.

HOLLAND'S

COFFEE AND DINING ROOM,
112 Fourth avenue,
Bet. 13th and 14th sts.

JAMES HOGAN, PRINCIPAL AGENT,<